FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-062
Monday
3 April 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-062

CONTENTS

3 April 1989

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

NATO General Galvin's 'Credo' Criticized *[Babenko in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 Mar]* 1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Perfilyev Gives Foreign Ministry Briefing 30 Mar *[PRAVDA 31 Mar]* 2
Perfilyev Gives 31 Mar Foreign Ministry Briefing 2
  Hijack Attempt Foiled in Baku *[AFP]* 2
  Comments on Afghanistan, Pakistan *[TASS]* 3
Western Views of Recent Elections Assessed *[Korionov in PRAVDA 1 Apr]* 3
Indian Ocean Seminar Studies Naval Arms 'Race' *[TASS]* 4
U.S. Wants Cocom Curbs on High-Definition TV *[TASS]* 5

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Vietnam's Economic, Social Stagnation Discussed *[PRAVDA 27 Mar]* 6
Burma's Economy, Foreign Debt Problems Viewed *[Moscow International]* 8

Near East & South Asia

Iranian Foreign Minister Velayati Visits Moscow 9
  Holds Talks With Shevardnadze *[TASS]* 9
  Discusses Iraq, Afghanistan *[Tehran IRNA]* 10
  Meets With Gorbachev *[Moscow Radio]* 10
  Gives Khamene'i Message to Gorbachev *[Tehran International]* 11
  Seen Off by Shevardnadze *[Moscow TV]* 11
Vorontsov Decries Interference in Afghanistan *[Sofia BTA]* 11
Afghan Foreign Ministry Reports on Fighting *[TASS]* 12
Opposition Plans Chemical Weapons Use at Jalalabad *[Moscow Radio]* 12
Many Afghan Rebel Units Opting for Cease-Fire *[TASS]* 13
Red Cross in Kabul Tries To Help Soviet POW's *[IZVESTIYA 1 Apr]* 13
'Arafat Named President of Palestine 13
  PLO Central Council Unanimous *[TASS]* 13
  'Arafat Political Adviser Comments *[TASS]* 14

Sub-Saharan Africa

Deputy Foreign Minister Adamishin in Zimbabwe 14
  Meets Zimbabwean Leader Mugabe *[TASS]* 14
  Vows Aid for 'Liberation Struggle' *[TASS]* 15
  Promises Continued Arms to ANC *[Johannesburg SAPA]* 15
Adamishin, Officials Review Namibia Issue *[Moscow TV]* 16

West Europe

Reportage on Gorbachev's 2 Apr Stopover in Ireland 19
  Irish Prime Minister Previews Visit *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 2 Apr]* 19
  USSR-Ireland Ties Previewed *[PRAVDA 2 Apr]* 20

  - Haughey Greets Gorbachev *[PRAVDA 3 Apr]* 21
  - Gorbachev Speaks on Arrival *[TASS]* 22
  - Haughey, Gorbachev Hold Talks *[TASS]* 22
  - Leaders Make Statements on Talks *[Moscow TV]* 23
  - Gorbachev Meets Press After Talks *[TASS]* 23
  - Gorbachev Departs for Cuba *[TASS]* 24
  - Paper Sums Up Meeting *[PRAVDA 3 Apr]* 24
  - Haughey Evaluates Talks *[TASS]* 25
- French Defense Minister Arrives, Met by Yazov *[TASS]* 25
  - Yazov, Chevenement Hold Talks *[TASS]* 26
  - Yazov Interviewed on Visit *[TASS]* 26
- UK Call for Najibullah Resignation Criticized *[PRAVDA 2 Apr]* 26
- British Press Welcomes Coming Gorbachev Visit *[TASS]* 26

Latin America & Caribbean

- Gorbachev Visits Cuba, Meets Castro 27
  - Ligachev, Yazov See Off Gorbachev *[TASS]* 27
  - Gorbachev Arrives in Havana *[IZVESTIYA 4 Apr]* 27
  - Cubans Welcome Gorbachev *[PRAVDA 4 Apr]* 28
  - Gorbachev Notes 'Genuine Enthusiasm' *[TASS]* 28
  - Gorbachev, Castro Meet Press *[Moscow International]* 29
  - Further on News Conference *[IZVESTIYA 4 Apr]* 29
  - Gorbachev Praises Welcome *[TASS]* 30
  - Gorbachev Grants Interview *[Moscow Radio]* 30
  - Gorbachev Tours Revolution Square *[TASS]* 30
  - Cuba Assembly Session Set for 4 Apr *[Moscow Radio]* 31
- Reportage on Visit, Soviet-Cuban Relations 31
  - Soviet-Cuban Ties Examined *[Dmitriyev on Moscow International]* 31
  - Foreign Ministry Official on Visit *[Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO 30 Mar]* 31
  - Visit Demonstrates 'New Thinking' *[Kozyakov on Moscow International]* 33
  - Agenda of Visit Outlined *[TASS]* 33
  - Cuban Vice Premier Previews Visit *[TASS]* 33
  - Cuban Vice Premier Views Ties *[IZVESTIYA 2 Apr]* 34
  - Komplektov, Yefimov Preview Visit *[TASS]* 35
  - Komplektov Views Visit, Bush Message *[Madrid EFE]* 35
  - Gerasimov Views Visit *[Havana Radio]* 36
  - Soviet Officials Discuss Cuba Trade *[TASS]* 36
  - Cuban Publicist Views Ties *[TASS]* 37
  - Havana Prepares for Visit *[TASS]* 37
  - PCC Secretariat Member Hails Visit *[TASS]* 38
  - Cuba-USSR Amity Chief Lauds Visit *[IZVESTIYA 1 Apr]* 38
  - Castro Message Welcomes Gorbachev *[TASS]* 39
- PRAVDA Reporters View Cooperation With Cuba *[TASS]* 39
- U.S. Criticized for Its 'Unchanged' Cuba Policy *[Moscow International]* 40

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

- Central Committee Agrarian Plenum Resolution *[PRAVDA 1 Apr]* 41
- Moscow Okrug Election Results Detailed *[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 28 Mar]* 44
- Restructuring Problems, Solutions Discussed *[Moscow TV]* 50
- 'Powerful Tremor' Registered in Spitak Area 30 Mar 70
  - No Human Casualties *[Moscow Radio]* 70
  - 11,000 Abandon Already Damaged Homes *[Yerevan Radio]* 71
  - Arutyunyan, Silayev Visit Site *[Yerevan Radio]* 71
- Georgian Leader Rejects Abkhaz Secession Bid *[IZVESTIYA 1 Apr]* 71
  - Georgians Protest Secession Demand *[AFP]* 72

Agricultural

Agricultural Seminar-Conference Held in Omsk 72
  Ligachev Comments *[Moscow TV]* 72
  Ligachev Gives Report *[TASS]* 73
  Vlasov Interviewed *[Moscow Radio]* 74
  Vlasov Visits Tavricheskiy Rayon *[Moscow TV]* 74
Agricultural Developments for 27 Mar-2 Apr 75

Scientific

Cosmonauts on 'Mir' Complex Continue Work *[TASS]* 76
'Storm of Protest' Over Japanese Space Flight *[TASS]* 76

NATO General Galvin's 'Credo' Criticized

PM0304102589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 Mar 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS political observer Yevgeniy Babenko commentary for KRASNAYA ZVEZDA: "Man From 'Earlier' Time"]

[Text] Events developed at lightning speed. First, Western Europe was neutralized by Soviet chemical weapons, and then the Warsaw Pact troops invaded. And here U.S. General J. Galvin, NATO supreme commander in chief, Europe, joined in.

He immediately asked the bloc leadership for permission for a nuclear strike. At first nuclear missiles descended on the territory of the socialist states. That proved not to be enough and Galvin demanded that powerful strikes be delivered against two targets in the FRG and another two in Turkey, since the Soviet Armed Forces had already crossed the borders of those states. There was just one thing wrong....

You ask from where this scenario to rend the heart of the Western man in the street was dragged. From some stale book of non-science fiction produced in the fifties? You would be wrong, both regarding the provenance of the work and regarding the date of its creation.

The date is our time, spring 1989. The place is NATO Headquarters where the "Wintex-Simex" military staff exercises have just been held. These "brain exercises" simulate the actions of the political leadership, military command, and staffs of the NATO bloc in the event of a crisis in East-West relations. And there was talk of exactly how "limited nuclear strikes" would be delivered during "World War III."

And so the NATO strategists are playing seriously at World War III! Of course, you can wave your arms angrily, urge these "planners" to come to their senses, to look out of the window or go out onto the street to talk with ordinary Europeans and find out how "glad" they are at the possibility of nuclear conflict. But is it worth it?

The attempt to introduce new political thinking in the heads of people like J. Galvin will hardly succeed. His military-political credo has long been well-known. You remember how when he was "in charge of" the U.S. armed forces in Central and South America, he threatened to occupy Nicaragua and personally led the bombing of that country's population centers from U.S. Air Force aircraft. And he viewed all Central America as nothing but a field in the battle against world communism.

To judge by the above-mentioned scenario the U.S. general is prepared today to turn Europe directly into such a battlefield as well.

It is no accident that the FRG representatives at the exercises, in "salvaging" their own territory, compelled the authors rapidly to rewrite the "Wintex-Simex" scenario. And when the decision to subject Turkey to a nuclear strike was nonetheless left in force, these games were halted for fear that the Turkish representatives would bang the door in protest until the imaginary missiles left. As the London TIMES wrote, neither Bonn nor Ankara "could endure the exposed nerves."

Now they've really gotten into a mess!

Perfilyev Gives Foreign Ministry Briefing 30 Mar

PM3103135189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Mar 89 Second Edition p 7

[Unattributed report: "Observing the Agreements"]

[Text] Speaking at a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists held on 30 March, V.P. Perfilyev, first deputy chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, when dwelling on questions concerning Afghanistan, said, among other things, the following:

Pursuing a line of strict observance of the accords achieved in Geneva, the Soviet side is seeking to cooperate to the utmost with the United Nations regarding the Afghan settlement and to collaborate closely with the UN secretary general.

The attention of that organization's leaders has been repeatedly drawn of late to the need to take urgent measures to secure a peaceful solution of the Afghan problem and stop the growing foreign intervention in that country's internal affairs. We, in particular, fully support the Afghan Government's idea of convening the Security Council to examine the progress made in carrying out the agreements by all parties, which, in our opinion, could be a very opportune move. We consider it essential that the United Nations render practical assistance in organizing regular meetings between representatives of Afghanistan and Pakistan, as envisaged under the agreements signed in Geneva. At the same time we wish to draw serious attention to the need to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of the UN monitoring machinery (UNGOMAP) [UN Good Offices Mission in Afghanistan and Pakistan] and set up for that purpose permanent monitoring posts on the Afghan-Pakistani border, particularly in Towr Kham. UN observers have the necessary mandate to operate in this way.

In its contacts with the UN Secretariat leadership the Soviet side has also energetically put forward the idea of convening an international conference on Afghanistan, toward which a meeting of experts or a working party for the exchange of opinions on problems pertaining to the Afghan settlement could serve as the first step. Representatives of the main Afghan forces, Afghanistan's immediate neighbors, and the Geneva agreements' guarantors could take part in such meetings held under the auspices of a representative of the UN secretary genereal.

At the same time the Soviet side is seeking to induce Pakistan and the United States, which are signatories of the agreements, to adhere strictly to the spirit and the letter of the accords. Unfortunately, our constructive line is not meeting with an appropriate response in either Islamabad or Washington.

Here I would like to stress with the utmost responsibility once again that in implementing the Geneva accords there can be and must be no double standards, whereby one side strictly and rigorously carries out all the accords, while the other openly ignores them.

As for Pakistan, its role in Afghan affairs is particularly unseemly. According to reports from Afghanistan, three out of every seven men in the armed opposition groupings fighting around Jalalabad are drawn from the maleshi; that is, are members of Pakistani tribal formations. Armed Arab Wahhabites, members of a sect from Saudi Arabia, who are trying to impose their faith on the local population by force, have also appeared in a number of regions of Afghanistan. A graphic example of the barbarous actions perpetrated by the opposition working in league with Pakistan in their unjust struggle was the shooting of a group of wives and mothers of Afghan refugees who wanted to recover the bodies of their nearest and dearest who had died near Jalalabad after being forcibly mobilized by extremists.

These actions are in sharp contrast to the humane, constructive efforts of Afghanistan designed to find a peaceful settlement of the Afghan conflict. President Najibullah's recent appeal to field commanders to cease fire is eliciting positive responses among those who hold dear Afghanistan's national interests. Thus, 13 field commanders in the Provinces of Paktia and Herat have accepted the president's offer and have entered into talks on a cessation of hostilities.

Perfilyev Gives 31 Mar Foreign Ministry Briefing

Hijack Attempt Foiled in Baku

AU3103114789 Paris AFP in English 1144 GMT 31 Mar 89

[Text] Moscow, March 31 (AFP)—Anti-terrorist commandos foiled an attempt to hijack a Soviet airliner at Baku airport in Azerbaijan Thursday night, Soviet spokesman Vadim Perfilyev announced here Friday.

The hijacker had seized the plane and demanded that it be flown to Pakistan. None of the 42 passengers or crew on board were hurt in the incident.

Mr. Perfilyev named the hijacker as 23-year-old Stanislas Skok. The man threatened to blow up the aircraft, a Tupelov-134, shortly after it took off from the town of Astrakhan in Azerbaijan at 11.20 p.m. Thursday (1820 GMT).

The aircraft landed at Baku, its destination, where an elite anti-terrorist commando formed last year was waiting.

The hijacker demanded to be flown to Pakistan and for 500,000 pounds sterling (850,000 dollars), Mr. Perfilyev said.

The commandos stormed the plane and overpowered Skok after he had released 26 women and children.

Mr. Perfilyev said Skok was unemployed and had been wanted by police since January.

Comments on Afghanistan, Pakistan

LD3103151289 Moscow TASS in English 1438 GMT 31 Mar 89

[Text] Moscow March 31 TASS—"The Soviet Union proceeds from the premise that a settlement in Central America as all other regional problems, requires serious attention and practical deeds", Vadim Perfilyev, first deputy chief of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Information Directorate, said at a briefing here today. Commenting on the numerous statements concerning the U.S. approach to the question of a Central American settlement, made by U.S. officials during the past 24 hours, he said: "We stand for joint efforts of the world community, in which much depends on Soviet-American interaction, to rule out seats of tension on the political map of the world. This, of course, can be done only if the interests of all the sides concerned are properly balanced and if the rights of every nation to free option and independent development are observed without fail".

Touching on the situation in Afghanistan, the spokesman of the Soviet Foreign Ministry said that regular armed forces of the Republic of Afghanistan had stemmed the attempts of the irreconcilable opposition to capture Jalalabad this Thursday. The opposition forces have suffered substantial losses. In retaliation for their defeat, they subjected the peaceful town to a heavy missile assault. It took a toll of 56 killed and about 200 wounded. Much damage was wrought in residential districts. "The present aggravation of the situation within and around Afghanistan, escalation of hostilities in the country cannot help influencing negatively the regional situation as a whole", Vadim Perfilyev said in this connection. "Responsibility for this situation rests primarily with Pakistan, which is overtly violating the Geneva accords. The guarantors of the Geneva accords could contribute to reconciliation and stability in Afghanistan. We expect Washington to prove by practical deeds its publicly declared desire to end the bloodshed".

Commenting on the statement issued by the Foreign Ministry of Afghanistan that, according to various sources, Pakistan is actively developing nuclear and chemical weapons and plans, moreover, to supply the latter to the irreconcilable opposition, Vadim Perfilyev stressed the dangerous nature of such plans. "The world community shares the views of the Republic of Afghanistan that it is impermissible to use chemical weapons in regional conflicts, because this would bring about a general deterioration of the situation and would create a concrete threat to peace and security throughout the world", the spokesman of the Soviet Foreign Ministry said. "It is necessary to prevent such a turn of events", he warned.

The session of the joint commission for monitoring the settlement of the South-West Africa problem, attended by representatives of Angola, Cuba, South Africa and also observers from the United States and the USSR, which ended in Havana the other day, was marked by a "spirit of goodwill and a joint search for a constructive political settlement of concrete problems in strict compliance with the assumed commitments". The spokesman of the Soviet Foreign Ministry stressed that the participants of the joint commission had declared their strict adherence to the assumed obligations.

Western Views of Recent Elections Assessed

PM3103193189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Apr 89 First Edition p 4

[Own political observer Vitaliy Korionov article: "Test"]

[Text] Journalists are frequently criticized for exaggerating, or making too much of a specific event or phenomenon. Nonetheless, I dare to claim that probably never before have processes under way in the USSR captured the attention of the whole world to such an extent as during the past 3 years, and especially at present.

The changes in the land of the soviets have burst into the political life and international relations on our planet like a whirlwind, forcing statesmen and politicians in East and West and their "think tanks" to study most attentively what is currently happening in the Soviet Union and to weigh up what impact these changes will have on their own countries. The U.S. politician Thomas Harkin has said, for instance: "Restructuring is like a breath of fresh air. It prompts Americans, too, to take a closer look at themselves and define their tasks. And so restructuring is also a life-giving process for the United States and peoples of other countries." Even the White House is aware of this. "I believe that in view of the changes in the Soviet Union, we are are faced with a serious problem, and, at the same time, also with tremendous opportunities"—this is the opinion of U.S. President G. Bush.

Naturally, the attitude in Western countries to Soviet restructuring is not uniform. Militarist circles in the United States, and in some other Western coutries, are clearly alarmed that the changes in the Soviet Union and our country's constructive foreign policy steps, which have introduced profound qualitative changes in the development of the situation in the world arena, may destroy the "image of the enemy." Hence, the efforts to prevent the collapse of the myth of the "Soviet military threat," no matter what the price. "If Gorbachev's program is successful, then the United States will, in the 21st century, find itself face to face with a Soviet Union that is considerably stronger in economic, political, and military terms," the Pentagon's economic experts reported in deliberately alarming tones to the U.S. Congress some time ago.

Notheless, something entirely different predominates in world public opinion. It is awareness of the fact that the Soviet restructuring has created an unprecedented climate in the world in which fruit, which formerly was just a dream, can ripen, fruit such as the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, for instance.

The strengthening of the USSR's positions in the world arena is an obvious consequence of the policy of restructuring and the establishment of the new political thinking. And it is particularly important that this strengthening has been achieved not just without a buildup of our military might, but in conditions of the incipient considerable reduction of our armed forces and in the face of existing unresolved domestic problems.

We are all aware how acute these problems are. We are also aware what the consequences of the solution of these problems would be, and vice versa, of their further exacerbation. History has posed us the following question: Either we will resolve these questions, and the USSR will further strengthen its prestige as a great international power, or we will not cope with them, and lose whatever we have.

Hence the extraordinary interest in the elections of USSR people's deputies and their results.

The election battles, and they were battles rather than voting without a choice, as in the past, were fought in the main sphere where power is at stake. They raged around the key question—for or against—restructuring. It is also of fundamental importance that the CPSU played the role of inspirer of restructuring and acted as the initiator of the changes both in the election system and the holding of the elections themselves. Here, let us be frank, the party was taking a certain risk, which was related, specifically, to its cadres. And, in fact, a number of senior party officials did not pass the election test. Well, let this serve as an object lesson. Soviet voters have shown that they are able to discern who is fighting for restructuring in earnest, and who is merely paying lip service to the struggle.

It is characteristic that even press organs which do not entertain any sympathies for socialism have noted: The elections have confirmed the Soviet people's support for the CPSU and its policy of transformation. "The election results," THE NEW YORK TIMES writes, "do not indicate that the voters have rejected the Communist Party, as many of those who have won the elections are Communists. However, they have dissociated themselves from members of the party who have failed to show enthusiasm for the program of political and economic renewal."

The elections have shown that the Soviet electorate supports the course of the party aimed at swifter and more tangible changes—this idea recurs like a refrain in the reactions of the world press. "The Soviet Union," the French L'HUMANITE notes, "is entering a new phase of its history. It is headed by the Communist Party, whose experience gained in victories and defeats, from joy and pain, must enable the Soviet people to advance even further in the cause of building socialism and spreading freedom."

Also characteristic are the remarks of the foreign press organs to the effect that the elections have confirmed the Soviet people's determination to defend their socialist choice. So the Paris LA TRIBUNE DE L'EXPANSION concludes: Soviet people did not vote for a Western democracy, and, of course, neither did they vote for a capitalist economy.

The course of the current election campaign has given Soviet people satisfaction. Naturally, there are no grounds for resting on laurels. Not everything is proceeding in the manner or the pace desired. Many difficulties and complications lie ahead. But, the people have faith in their party and its ability, not just to defend, but also to further advance the revolutionary cause of restructuring. And they will continue to back this kind of party in the future.

Indian Ocean Seminar Studies Naval Arms 'Race'

LD3003201789 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1351 GMT 30 Mar 89

[Text] Moscow, 30 March (TASS)—TASS political observer Vladimir Matyash writes:

The international seminar on the problem of transforming the Indian Ocean into a peace zone, which is being held under UN auspices, has been continuing its work in the famous Soviet resort center of Sochi on the Black Sea Caucasian coast. The attention of its participants is focused on the incessant naval armaments race, the escalation of naval activity, and the strengthening of the nuclear factor in this activity. All of this insistently requires the adoption of specific and effective international measures to control and restrict the naval activities and naval armaments of states.

The urgency of tackling these tasks has particularly increased now that the United States is not concealing its intention of putting particular emphasis on the development of its naval forces and the active use of them to pursue its globalist policies.

This is shown by the plans to modernize the navies of the United States and other NATO countries, by the equipping of U.S. ships with cruise missiles, the build-up in the numbers of ships in the U.S. Navy, and finally by the very actions of U.S. ships, including those against Libya, in the Persian Gulf, and the provocative incursions into Soviet territorial waters in the Black Sea and in the Far East.

Indeed the naval activities of states are not covered by the confidence-building measures that were worked out in Stockholm, as yet the process of reducing nuclear armaments does not extend to naval forces, and an approach has not been found to tackling the problem of strengthening naval security in the areas of the Mediterranean, northern Europe, the Asian-Pacific region, including the Indian Ocean, and other parts of the world.

The reluctance of Washington and its allies to discuss issues of limiting naval activity and reducing naval armaments is easily explained. The basis of this stand is not only the superiority of the United States and NATO in terms of an absolute majority of naval armaments, but also the openly declared intentions to use that superiority at sea to exert a decisive influence on the course and outcome of a possible future war, to "create a global threat to Soviet interests."

In recent years the USSR has several times put forward foreign policy initiatives aimed at reducing the military presence and military activity in various areas of the world's oceans. For instance, in the 1986-1988 period alone Moscow put foward measures regulating naval activity in the Pacific and Indian Oceans, the Mediterranean and Baltic Seas, the zone of the Persian Gulf, and international straits with intensive shipping. The USSR is proposing to summon a special international conference or a special session of the UN Security Council to discuss the issue of reducing naval confrontation in the oceans and on the seas. The Warsaw Pact member states have addressed to the NATO member states and all CSCE participant states the proposal to start negotiations on limiting and banning naval activity in agreed sea areas, on limiting and reducing naval armaments, and on extending confidence-building measures to sea and ocean areas, with the aim of ensuring the safety and freedom of sea shipping.

U.S. Wants Cocom Curbs on High-Definition TV

LD2903153589 Moscow TASS in English 1525 GMT 29 Mar 89

[Text] Tokyo March 29 TASS—By TASS correspondent Vladimir Kuchko:

The U.S. Administration has called upon Japan and West European countries to extend the restrictions on export to socialist countries introduced by the Coordinating Committee on Export Controls (Cocom) to cover high definition television technologies.

This call, the Japanese newspaper NIHON KEIZAI reported today with reference to government circles, was made by a U.S. spokesman at a recent committee session in Paris. Washington asserts that the new high-tech television system uses for video recording high definition light-sensitive components which can be employed by the military to equip, for example, their spy satellites.

At present, the Japanese newspaper said, competition between Japan, Western Europe and the United States has become much stiffer as they vie for leadership in new television technologies and thus also for tomorrow's markets.

According to expert opinion, new high-tech television will usher in an era of electronic cinema, and this bespeaks a world market with annual sales worth dozens of billions of dollars, as the introduction of high definition television will require complete replacement of every television transmitter and receiver now in use.

The leading Japanese electronic companies Sony and Toshiba as well as their West European rivals have already developed experimental high definition systems, while American researchers are still engaged in technical designing. This explains why the United States is pressing for Cocom restrictions to cover high-definition television. They are not so much concerned about security as about binding their rivals hand and foot, the newspaper said.

Listing new television technologies under Cocom headings will mean new restrictions on sales of TV equipment at foreign markets. This, in turn, will curtail its mass production. This is why American calls have met with a negative response in Tokyo, where a government spokesman declared that "high definition television is a civil commodity and has nothing to do with Cocom".

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Vietnam's Economic, Social Stagnation Discussed

PM0304084589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Mar 89 Second Edition p 5

[Special correspondents M. Domogatskikh, M. Korolev, and Ye. Spekhov dispatch under the rubric "Cooperation": "Renewal Is Akin to Restructuring"; first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] Hanoi-Moscow—We call our time restructuring. The Vietnamese call it renewal. The task facing us and our Vietnamese friends is the same—overcoming stagnation in the economy and society and developing democracy and glasnost. The process of renewal in Vietnam is proceeding with difficulty. PRAVDA journalists invited to the country by the editorial office of the fraternal newspaper NHAN DAN were given the opportunity to acquaint themselves with the party's life and policy at the crucial stage of renewal.

The word "renewal" came into use after the Sixth Communist Party of Vietnam [CPV] Congress. It expressed the purport of the party's policy and the desire of the entire people to end the period of stagnation and the bureaucratic-administrative system of economic management.

One February day in Hanoi when the temperature was 23 degrees Celsius above zero—unusual "winter" weather for Muscovites—we were received by Dao Duy Tung, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPV Central Committee. The topic of our discussion was the three main programs which were put forward at the Sixth CPV Congress and accord with the vital interests of the state and the people: programs to increase the production of food, consumer goods, and export articles. These priorities, it is easy to see, entail a whole chain of tasks in the sphere of economic development. How can they be resolved? Where are the necessary resources to be found?

Yet even in the course of the precongress debate it became obvious that the section of cadres raised on the system of administrative edicts issued from on high, which perceived these edicts as the ultimate truth, was unable to grasp why the party had embarked on a course aimed at developing all sectors of the economy, rather than just the state sector. When the party had merely noted the fact of a mixed economy, these people did not object. But as soon as the course was set toward the practical utilization of this characteristic of Vietnam, there were irritated shouts of: "This is a deviation from the principles of socialism." Why then did the former "well established order" do little to ease the life of the working people in all the years that had elapsed since the war? And why is the republic making slow progress in economic development, despite the assistance of the fraternal socialist countries?

The more than 2 years which have elapsed since the congress has been a time of quest and experimentation. There have been errors, too. A renewal of the party and the state apparatus has been under way and changes have taken place in the organizational and ideological forms of work. Various options for the economic mechanism have been tried and replaced with new ones, certain of its components and assemblies have begun to interact more successfully. Models and examples worthy of emulation have been created.

The Politburo, Dao Duy Tung said, has attentively studied the opinions of communists on the processes of renewal and its acceptable and unacceptable nuances. On this basis decisions of fundamental importance were adopted in the sphere of economic development, price formation, finance, wages, and material supply.

The abolition of ration coupons for rice and industrial goods and the introduction of uniform market prices for staple food products will clearly make it necessary for the state to find additional funds to compensate for the population's additional expenditure. Under the coupon system, rice cost 60 dong per kg. Its price has now risen to 600 dong in the state trade network, and on the market rice costs almost as much. The prices for basic necessities have changed similarly.

We did not see any people waiting in line in Vietnam. This observation is a cause for both joy and worry: The system of cost-of-living subsidies introduced in view of the abolition of firm prices is not totally effective. Life is hardest for those who live exclusively on their wages without any additional income. It is obvious that the new mechanism needs "adjustment." However, the abundance of goods—clothing, footwear, fabrics, and household articles—in the stores is striking. Where did they come from? Is this really the result of the new prices policy alone?

Dao Duy Tung cited four reasons for the increased volume of goods. Goods production increased by 11 percent last year. The policy of support for private, family, and individual enterprise has had its effect. When the restrictions were removed, both raw materials and equipment suddenly appeared and the desire to produce nice things for sale was rekindled. Another circumstance came to light. The former low prices for goods distributed under the coupon system led to hoarding. And now some people have decided to make the most of market conditions and make a killing. At the state's expense, of course. This is the price for the flaws of the former system....

Furthermore, hundreds of thousands of families have relatives living abroad and receive parcels from them. A tour of the stalls is like a geography lesson. Add to this the 150,000 Vietnamese who work abroad—60,000 of them in the Soviet Union. They send and bring in goods.

Smuggling was mentioned. For the time being it is tolerated here. People freely exchange goods at the border. There are quite a few goods from China in the stalls. Fishermen put out to sea, and there traders from the neighboring country are sometimes already waiting for them. And again there is buying and selling. We can testify: In Hanoi, Haiphong, and especially in Ho Chi Minh City the stalls are overflowing with goods.

However, the main point is that the new mechanism of economic management and price formation has come fully into play, and restrictions on labor activity and the size of wages have been removed. This is what has produced the results.

Goods are being advertised in the press and on television—an unprecedented phenomenon in Vietnam's recent history. Sometimes the goods that are advertised are not of top quality. However, it cannot be denied that a step forward toward a better future has been taken.

In general the goods are a pleasing sight. This is a great plus. However, there is also the other side of the coin. The new situation in trade sometimes pushes the state sector to the sidelines, polarizes the material position of various sections of the population, and evokes different moods in people. Some people spend the equivalent of 6 months' wages for a worker or employee on a restaurant meal. Meanwhile, a famous theater director or writer can barely make ends meet. The situation is complex and is causing party and state leaders much concern. More than once people to whom we talked expressed alarm that market forces may go too far. However, more often our interlocutors expressed optimism and confidence that the course toward developing the mixed economy will bear fruit.

Examples of the beneficial effects of this policy can be seen everywhere. For instance, in a very short time cotton plantations have doubled. For years economists have been racking their brains to find a means of establishing specialized cotton-growing state farms. Yet the solution proved simple. Peasants were given help with money, fertilizers, and seeds, fair purchase prices were introduced, in short, people were given an incentive. And suddenly things began happening where formerly progress had seemed impossible.

The cottage industry sector of the economy has surged forward. Private enterprises and companies are being set up, and workshops, usually run by families, are springing up in their thousands. In Ho Chi Minh City, for instance, money paid into the budget by the private and the individual sector exceeds the budget revenue from state enterprises severalfold. The country's export potential is growing.

Consequently, the priority economic programs are being implemented. Unemployment is subsiding. During the past year alone, several hundred thousand people found jobs.

There were people in the party and the government who had their doubts and did not understand the course of renewal, Dao Duy Tung said. Some believed that by making concessions to the private sector, we were virtually betraying the principles of socialism. But why should socialism not make use of all available levers to promote economic development for the benefit of the people? After all, it was Lenin who advocated precisely this approach—making use of all the forces which can assist socialism. However, this does not mean that we need not consolidate the state sector. It is the base and main force of socialism.

Noticeable changes have occurred in the Vietnamese countryside. The family contract and leasing, which have become the main forms of economic organization, are reviving in peasants the feeling that they are the masters of the land and are also simplifying management. In the northern provinces alone, the management apparatus of cooperatives has been reduced by 200,000 people. No one has any doubts about the role which the contract system has played in the development of the countryside. However, people here are not blind, either, to the fact that the system has led to a certain stratification of the peasantry. Some are growing richer, while others cannot make ends meet. There are many reasons for this: The material situation of families, the number of able-bodied family members, the availability of draft animals and implements, the possibility of using machinery—all this is having an impact. There is no denying this. Our Vietnamese comrades believe that a sharp stratification of rural workers must be prevented, and they are working on state measures to protect needy peasants, which encompass both taxation policy and social assistance to the needy.

Incidentally, similar problems exist also in the state sector of industry. There are enterprises which firmly stand on their own feet. And others exist on subsidies from year to year.

The responsibility in this case, the Politburo member and secretary of the CPV Central Committee said, falls above all on managers. At loss-making enterprises managers wait for miracles to happen—they wait for someone to procure raw and other materials for them; they wait for prices of their output to rise sky-high so that their enterprises can join the ranks of "profitable" enterprises; they wait for customers rather than looking for them; and, of course, most of all they wait and hope that the state will continue to assist them with subsidies in the future. Freeloading attitudes, lack of initiative, and indifference cannot lead to anything good. We must put an end to the practice of waiting for miracles.

In recent years the country has been living in an atmosphere of constant price increases—up to 500 percent per year. As a CPV Central Committee plenum noted, this has led to serious social complications in society, a deterioration of people's living standards, and difficulties in the economy. Inflation is, of course, a reflection of economic problems.

The situation in the country remains complex. The price reform that has been launched, the revival of business activity which has begun, improved indicators in the supply of goods to the population, and the attention that is being paid to all sectors of the economy have made it possible at the beginning of the year to arrest the rise in inflation. Now it is necessary to decrease expenditure on subsidies to loss-making enterprises—last year they totaled 300 billion dong—raise the efficiency of the national economy, reduce the budget disproportions, develop all forms of commodity production, and extricate the country from the economic crisis.

People told us frankly that the most neglected problem which is causing the greatest concern to the party and the government is the social problem. The level of unemployment remains high. This is the country's most painful problem. Democracy and glasnost have opened up for people spheres of life which used to be beyond criticism. It is now openly admitted that 1.7 million teachers, doctors, and members of the creative intelligentsia, 250,000 party and state apparatus officials, and hundreds of thousands of people in other categories of employment are living on the brink of poverty. Meanwhile, the proprietor of a small store can earn 1 million dong or more per month. This is giving rise to sharp criticism and difficult issues, including issues to the party. But could it be otherwise, given the economic difficulties and the painful switch to new forms of management?

It is obvious that a great many problems have accumulated during the past years.

Quite so, Dao Duy Tung confirmed, there are still many difficulties. Sometimes it seems that more and more of them are coming up. However, neither the party nor the people is panicking. Against the backdrop of what has been achieved over the past 2 years, confidence in the triumph of the new course is growing.

This is what we felt during our tour of fraternal Vietnam.

Burma's Economy, Foreign Debt Problems Viewed

BK0104152389 Moscow in Burmese to Burma 1030 GMT 31 Mar 89

[Station observer Yevgeniy Mikhaylov: "Burma—A Time of Changing Fiscal Years"]

[Text] Studying the economic history of Burma, one can see that the country has never experienced a more difficult year than the present 1988-89 fiscal year which is about to end. It would be hard to use the term progress to describe the situation. Political crises, which stalled major economic enterprises for extended periods and even brought some of them to a complete halt, have drastically reduced the volume of production and services in Burma. Likewise, the transport and communications sectors are also in a state of disorder. This was pointed out at a press conference in Rangoon by Colonel Abel, the man in charge of planning and finance in Burma today. Despite the difficulties, predictions being made for the future by government organizations responsible for the national economy are quite encouraging. Colonel Abel declared that 3.4 percent economic growth was expected. Rice, teak, minerals, and a variety of beans and pulses would be major export items, and measures were being taken to increase export volumes.

How these results could be achieved should be examined. As it appears now, General Saw Maung's government seems to reckon that economic reforms announced immediately after they assumed power would bear fruit in the very year which has just now begun. Presently, development of free markets, private trading, and private enterprises are being encouraged and nurtured in Burma. The Burmese leadership seems to expect that investment in the national economy could be considerably increased by results achieved by cooperatives and private enterprises. Furthermore, special reliance is placed on adoption of open door policy to foreign investment. The government is making [illegible] efforts to attract foreign investors. However, as [illegible] appears now, dramatic change in the attitude of foreign companies towards Burma is unlikely. Multinational corporations usually take part only when huge returns [illegible] their investments are certain. However, present conditions of other structures which support the economy are so bad that exploitation of Burma's natural resources is quite difficult. Until now, foreign companies are seen taking part only in those ventures where the fastest and highest returns can be expected, especially in fisheries and timber extraction.

Experts, however, have pointed out that Burma's present capacity and level of cooperation with foreign companies cannot help accelerate improvements in the economic situation. Bearing this in mind, General Saw Maung's government is intending to appeal for a resumption of aid to former donor countries. After 18 September of last year, only Japan has resumed normal relations with the Rangoon government, and hinted about the possibility of continued economic aid. As for other former donors, they are continuing their economic boycott against Burma. Such boycotts especially aggravate Burma's foreign debt problems. Burma's foreign debt at present totals $4.2 billion, owed mainly to Japan, the United States of America, the Federal Republic of Germany, and other Western countries. According to some data, Burma likely will be able to settle only $300 million out of these debts. Heavy foreign debt burdens aggravate Burma's budget deficit problems, and create pressures to even further reduce already paltry investments.

In answering a question as to whether Burma will be able to shoulder so much responsibility, observers have replied that it will depend wholly or substantially on the situation of political stability and implementation of democratic reforms in the country. If this can be agreed upon and accepted, we can see that General Saw Maung's government is trying hard to carry out that great responsibility.

Implementation of various measures by the State Law and Order Restoration Council for the holding of multiparty general elections has indicated that political changes could possibly strengthen Burma's economic reforms of the last fiscal year.

Hence, station observer Yevgeniy Mikhaylov concludes by saying that there can be optimism although we cannot be definite about it yet.

Near East & South Asia

Iranian Foreign Minister Velayati Visits Moscow

Holds Talks With Shevardnadze

LD3103183389 Moscow TASS in English 1820 GMT 31 Mar 89

[Text] Moscow March 31 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze held talks with his Iranian counterpart 'Ali Akbar Velayati here today.

The Iranian foreign minister was on a brief working visit in the USSR at Shevardnadze's invitation.

In the talks, held in a businesslike and constructive atmosphere, the sides held a substantive exchange of views on issues related to bilateral Soviet-Iranian relations and international problems of mutual interest.

They expressed mutual satisfaction with the steady advancement of bilateral ties and cooperation that are entering a qualitatively new stage.

The ministers gave special attention to issues of the Afghan settlement. They analyzed the situation in Afghanistan and around it in the light of the search for ways to end bloodshed in that country and find a political solution to the Afghan problem on the basis of aspirations of the Afghan people.

Shevardnadze stressed the urgent need for strict compliance with the Geneva agreements that are fundamental documents for the peaceful settlement in Afghanistan.

This applies primarily to Pakistan whose military circles are pursuing an obstructionist course with regard to the Geneva accords, encouraging the irreconcilable Afghan opposition to continue the fratricidal war, providing it with large quantities of weapons and extending otherotypes of military assistance.

Velayati confirmed that Iran intends to continue its efforts towards the political settlement of the Afghan problem proceeding from aspirations of the Afghan people and their right to determine their future on their own.

The Soviet minister stated with satisfaction that Iran, even though it is not a party to the Geneva accords, displays a realistic approach to the situation in Afghanistan, comes out in favour of establishing peace and ending bloodshed on Afghan soil, and undertakes practical steps towards this end.

The ministers paid much attention to questions linked with the final Iran-Iraq settlement.

The Soviet minister expressed confidence that the Iran-Iraq talks, held through the UN secretary-general, may lead to positive results.

The Soviet side voiced readiness to facilitate the attainment of a comprehensive settlement. In this context, the USSR reaffirmed its principled stance on the final Iran-Iraq settlement on the basis of UN Security Council Resolution 598 by way of a constructive dialogue between Iran and Iraq and their cooperation with the UN secretary-general with a view to finding a sensible balance of interests.

The Iranian foreign minister said that his country will continue, as before, cooperation with the UN secretary-general for establishing peace and stability in the region and resolving outstanding problems by way of talks.

Both sides favoured the earliest withdrawal from the Persian Gulf of the warships of states that do not belong to that region, which would facilitate the establishment of peace and security in that part of the world.

The ministers reaffirmed the two sides' mutual interst in maintaining the Soviet-Iranian political dialogue.

It was agreed that 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani, speaker of Iran's Islamic Consultative Assembly, will pay an official visit to the Soviet Union at the invitation of President of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Mikhail Gorbachev in the first half of this year.

The sides agreed to start preparations for this important visit and set out a number of specific functions to be arranged in this connection in the political, economic and other spheres.

The discussion was attended by Konstantin Katushev, minister for foreign economic relations of the USSR, and Nikolay Konarev, chairman of the Soviet part of the standing Soviet-Iranian commission for economic cooperation and minister of railways of the USSR.

Groups of experts on issues of bilateral relations and regional problems also held their sessions.

Discusses Iraq, Afghanistan

LD3103171789 Tehran IRNA in English 1655 GMT 31 Mar 89

[Text] Tehran, March 31, IRNA—Foreign Minister 'Ali Akbar Velayati held the first round of talks with his Soviet counterpart Eduard Shevardnadze in Moscow today.

The talks follow earlier negotiations between experts of the two countries to study the ground for bilateral political, economic and international cooperation.

Exchange of messages between leaders of the two countries has opened a new chapter in Tehran-Moscow ties, Shevardnadze said in the meeting, referring to the leader of the Islamic revolution's message to Mikhail Gorbachev (Jan. 4) and the latter's reply a month later which the Foreign Minister himself delivered to Imam Khomeyni.

"The Soviet leadership attaches significance to mutual talks, and your visit shows that bilateral cooperation has found its practical aspects," Shevardnadze told Velayati.

"We should take advantage of the current atmosphere to create concrete grounds for mutual cooperation," he added.

In his unprecedented message Imam Khomeyni had praised Gorbachev's sagacity in relaxing the "repressive communist atmosphere" and had called on the Soviet leader to seriously study Islam as a substitute for the Marxist system.

The Soviet Union has a rapidly expanding 60-million plus Muslim population which shares religious, cultural and lingual similarities with its Iranian brethren across the borders, and Gorbachev's reply foresaw good-neighbourliness and cooperation in various fields.

Tehran-Moscow ties have undergone "qualitative changes" over the past months and mutual relations has found a "trustworthy base", Velayati replied.

The two sides also discussed UN Resolution 598 in the meeting, where Velayati reiterated that Iraq should give up impeding the peace talks and cooperate with the UN chief to implement the resolution.

"The first step in this regard is its (Baghdad's) pulling out forces to the internationally-recognized boundaries," he said, pointing out that Iraq still occupies some 2,000 kms of Iranian soil.

Shevardnadze said his country is ready for any cooperation with the UN chief for speedy execution of the resolution, which seeks peace in the Iraqi imposed conflict.

On Afghanistan, Velayati termed "positive" the Soviet withdrawal from that Muslim country, stressing that the issue should be settled "within a regional framework and according to the will of the Afghan Muslims without any outside interference."

"Tehran backs an independent and nonaligned Afghanistan governed by its own Muslim people," Velayati said, noting that Moscow can help the political settlement and prevent further bloodletting there, by adopting a "realistic approach."

The only countries sharing borders with landlocked Afghanistan are Iran, Pakistan and the USSR, with the tip of the narrow Vakhan tail touching China in the remote northeastern Pamir peaks, but of late rank outsiders have tried to meddle in the Muslim country by proxy.

The Iranian and Soviet foreign ministers also discussed issues relevant to economic, technical and industrial cooperation between their respective countries in the meeting. Velayati arrived in Moscow Thursday [30 March].

Meets With Gorbachev

LD3103161989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 31 Mar 89

[Text] Today in the Kremlin Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev received 'Ali Akbar Velayati, the minister of foreign affairs of the Islamic Republic of Iran. Beginning the conversation Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev noted the growth of the dynamism in the relations between the Soviet Union and Iran in the spirit of good-neighborliness. He stressed the role of the political will of both countries' leaders and noted the exchange of messages with Imam Khomeyni. He expressed readiness for a further political dialogue and the expansion of economic, cultural, and other links. For us, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said, Iran is a welcome partner.

The improvement of relations between the Soviet Union and Iran also has international significance. In the context of Soviet-Iranian relations Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev set forth the Soviet Union's position on problems relating to Afghanistan, the Middle East, the Iran-Iraq settlement, and a number of common issues relating to the world situation.

Velayati acquainted Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev with the reply message from President Khamene'i. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev welcomed the spirit of the message and drew attention to the importance of the thoughts expressed there. They will all be studied thoroughly. The content of the message testifies to an expansion of the zones of understanding and accord on major problems affecting the interests of both states.

The interlocutors agreed in their assessment of the importance of the visit this coming summer to the USSR by Hashemi-Rafsanjani, speaker of the Iranian parliament. The visit opens opportunites for the development of Soviet- Iranian relations at a higher level.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev asked for greetings to be passed on to Imam Khomeyni and President Khamene'i, as well as good wishes to the Iranian people and realization of the ideas of the revolution.

Present at the meeting were: Comrade Shevardnadze; Va'ezi and Lavasani, Iran's deputy ministers of foreign affairs; and the ambassadors Gudev and Heirani-Nobari.

Gives Khamene'i Message to Gorbachev

LD3103212289 Tehran in English to Europe 1930 GMT 31 Mar 89

[Text] Mr Velayati, Iran's foreign minister, today met with Mikhail Gorbachev, the Soviet leader, and submitted President Khamene'i's message and said our relations are improving, and as I have noted in my message to His Excellency Imam Khomeyni, I maintain special value for relations between these two cities. [sentence as heard]

The Soviet leader also expressed support for the Islamic revolution and ideals of the Iranian people, and announced the Soviet Union's readiness for cooperation in Iran's reconstruction operations.

Then Mr Velayati, Iran's foreign minister, said political exchange of views between the Soviet Union and Iran, specially exchange of messages between the leaders of the two countries, have guided mutual interrelations toward qualitatively profound developments.

Seen Off by Shevardnadze

LD3103174989 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 31 Mar 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Today Iranian Foreign Minister Velayati left the Soviet Union. He was seen off at the airport by Comrade Shevardnadze and other officials. [video shows still photo of Shevardnadze with the Iranian delegation at the airport]

Vorontsov Decries Interference in Afghanistan

AU3103113389 Sofia BTA in English 0747 GMT 31 Mar 89

[Yuliy Vorontsov: "Diplomacy Must Defeat Arms"—BTA headline]

[Text] Sofia, March 31 (BTA)—"We are confronted with a fundamentally different political situation: The Soviet troops have been withdrawn from Afghanistan but bellicose foreigners invade from a neighbouring country," says Mr Yuliy Vorontsov, describing the changed conditions in Afghanistan. In an extensive interview with Mr Volodya Stratiev, special correspondent of the RABOTNICHESKO DELO daily in Kabul, the first deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR and ambassador of the Soviet Union to Afghanistan emphasizes that the Geneva accords, which bear the signatures not only of Afghanistan and the USSR but of Pakistan and the U.S. as well, are being flagrantly violated.

Mr Yuliy Vorontsov says that the "Republic of Afghanistan seeks to establish peace in the country but it is simply denied this chance. It is precisely by military means, coming from neighbouring countries and more specifically from Pakistan, that Afghanistan is being prevented from achieving peace." The Soviet diplomat says that there are three lines of resistance: the so-called mujahidin, the advisers from certain Arab countries, and the Pakistani units that spur on the mujahidin offensive and would not allow them to retreat. "It can be said with complete certainty that Pakistan and more specifically the Pakistani military are involved in the fighting on Afghan soil," Mr Vorontsov says.

He recalls that the Geneva accords are a balanced document whereby Pakistan has undertaken not to allow intervention from its territory. "Pakistan is entirely violating these accords," the Soviet diplomat says, and he reveals that Islamabad is working out "legal evidence" to prove that the Geneva accords are null and void now that a self-proclaimed transitional mujahidin government has been formed. All this calls into question Pakistan's political credibility. The political credibility of the U.S. in its capacity as guarantor of the accords becomes questionable, too, once it allows Pakistan to violate them. "What trust can be placed in the American signature and how can other agreements be signed with the U.S. once it fails to honour the commitments assumed in Geneva?" asks the first deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR.

Further on in his interview he discusses the significant role which the UN can play and the role of certain Arab countries.

"So long as attempts to settle the Afghan problem from the outside by military means continue, we will keep renderning military aid to Afghanistan," Mr Vorontsov goes on to say. He recalls the Soviet proposal that all sides stop their arms deliveries, a proposal declined by the West. "The country's armed forces are strong and they fight well, as evidenced by the battle for Jalalabad, and if the pressure goes on mounting, they will receive defense assistance," the diplomat says. He tells about the Soviet economic and food aid to Afghanistan.

He says he is optimistic about the prospects for a way out of the present situation. He believes that there are indications of a serious rift among the mujahidin and that Jalalabad will not fall.

Asked whether the Soviet Union will take further steps at the UN to bring about an early political settlement of the conflict, Mr Vorontsov answers: "Such steps are being taken right now. At the UN we insist that the secretary general intensify his efforts in search of ways for political settlement. We support Najibullah's idea of an international conference. We would like to see the UN initiate such a conference, and we believe that preparations can start immediately."

Afghan Foreign Ministry Reports on Fighting

LD0204205789 Moscow TASS in English 2045 GMT 2 Apr 89

[Text] Kabul April 3 TASS—Between March 29 and April 1 groups of the "irreconcilable" opposition made numerous attempts to resume, under the cover of mortar and artillery fire, their offensive on Jalalabad, the centre of Nangarhar Province, from southern, south-eastern and western directions, local and foreign journalists were told at a briefing at the Afghan Foreign Ministry.

These attempts were foiled with the mujahideen rebels sustaining heavy losses: some 450 people killed and 525 wounded. The rebels were supported by Pakistani servicemen and malishi [tribal militia]. Government troops destroyed with artillery fire two stores with arms and ammunition, three convoys of trucks of Pakistan's 11th and 18th infantry divisions, which brought ammunition and arms to Nangarhar Province.

The successful actions by the Afghan Army sow terror, panic and defeatist feelings among mujahideen. There were cases of self-inflicted maiming reportedly to get out of the Jalalabad massacre.

Over the past twenty four hours units of the "irreconcilable" opposition restarted attacks on the positions of the city defenders but were repelled by counterattacks, losing 97 men killed and 67 wounded. Two stores and five truckloads of arms and ammunition were destroyed, along with eight mortars, two recoilless guns, 12 rocket launchers and two heavy machine guns. Seven Afghan servicemen were wounded, and four civilians killed and eight others wounded, including women and children, in Jalalabad.

The city of Khowst in Paktia Province came under intensive shelling. Government troops held mopping up operations in some areas of Daman District in Qandahar Province, killing nine and wounding seven mujahidin rebels and capturing an arms deport. A large armed group of the Islamic Society of Afghanistan lost in a battle with the Afghan Army 120 people killed, weapons and ammunition in the Rostaq settlement in Takhar Province.

Workers of the Ministry of State Security uncovered 11 kilograms of explosives in one of the districts of the capital. The extremists planned to set off the explosives, hidden in vegetable oil cans and iron pipes, in the densely populated districts of Kabul. Last Saturday security forces rendered harmless a cache with arms, ammunition and toxins in the capital, which belonged to the opposition Movement of Islamic Revolution of Afghanistan. Leaflets and subversive anti-state literature were found in a hiding place.

Heavy fighting broke out between anti-government groups of the Islamic Party of Afghanistan, led by Burhanuddin Rabbani, in Farah, Herat and Badakhshan provinces. According to reports reaching here, mujahidin rebels lost nearly 200 killed and scores wounded in the armed clashes.

The Afghan Foreign Ministry handed to the UN Good Offices Mission three more notes, which cite new violations by Pakistan of the Geneva accords.

Despite the continuing combat operations in various regions of Afghanistan, refugees continue to arrive from Pakistan and Iran. According to the BAKHTAR News Agency, more than 500 Afghan nationals returned into Sar-e Pol Province from abroad. Local authorities rendered the necessary financial and material assistance to the returnees and provided vehicles for delivering the compatriots to the places of permanent residence.

The London newspaper THE SUNDAY MAIL quoted reliable sources as saying that the Pakistani military were coordinating mujahidin operations on the approaches to Qandahar, Jalalabad, and Kabul. The newspaper wrote that Pakistani intervention in Afghanistan constituted direct violation of the Geneva accords and would lead to serious diplomatic complications.

Opposition Plans Chemical Weapons Use at Jalalabad

LD0204130489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 2 Apr 89

[Text] According to available information, extremist circles of the Afghan irreconcilable opposition intend to use chemical weapons near Jalalabad. This was stated in conversation with a TASS correspondent by Zabihollah Ziarmal, [name as heard] head of the main political department of the Afghan Army. Artillery shells for long-range, chemical-filled weapons are already in the hands of the armed rebel formations, he said. Moreover, the most irresponsible elements in the leadership of the Peshawar Alliance of Seven support their use, while the field commanders directly involved in the battle of

Jalalabad are against such a step, in particular because the no-man's land along the frontlines is too narrow, something that will inevitably lead to sectors under the control of antigovernment formations being hit.

Many Afghan Rebel Units Opting for Cease-Fire

LD0304092889 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0822 GMT 3 Apr 89

[Text] Kabul, 3 April (TASS)—TASS correspondent Andrey Greshnov reports: With the completion of the Soviet troop withdrawal from Afghanistan, the opposition has no excuse for continuing the bloodshed. Many of the opponents of the present regime, realizing the complete hopelessness of the armed confrontation, have contacted representatives of the authorities and signed agreements on a cease-fire. In the last Afghan year alone which ended on 20 March of this year, 11,372 members of the opposition, forming the backbone of 82 antigovernment formations, gave up their armed activity.

According to information obtained from knowledgeable sources, dozens of other combat groupings from the "Seven Party" and the "Eight Party" alliances, joining together several thousand people in their ranks, are holding talks with representatives of the government on the question of a cease-fire and granting them rights of equal participation in running the affairs of the state. The leaders of these groups have requested that for a certain amount of time, their "party" membership and where they are stationed should not be revealed in order to protect their people from provocation and armed attacks from the "irreconcilables". There are incidents to show that such attacks can occur.

According to reports received here, after the unsuccessful offensive against the administrative center of Nangarhar Province, the town of Jalalabad, hundreds of fighters from the groupings within the "Alliance of Seven" deserted from the battlefield, returned to their families living in refugee camps near Peshawar, and intended to return to Afghanistan. However the extremist-minded formations of the "irreconcilables," with the support of subunits from the Pakistan Army, carried out mass roundups in recent days in areas of Pakistan bordering on Afghanistan, throwing hundreds of Afghans behind the barbed wire of the infamous Badaber Camp.

However, despite the intensifying repressions, more and more Afghans, realizing that they are being used as "cannon fodder" on the Jalalabad front, are overcoming the military cordons and returning to their homes. In the past week alone, 250 Afghan families composed of about 5,000 people returned to Paktia Province from Pakistan.

Red Cross in Kabul Tries To Help Soviet POW's

PM0204171989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Apr 89 Morning Edition p 4

[A. Ivanko dispatch under the rubric "Panorama of International Events": "Afghanistan: The Rebels Do Not Want a Truce. IZVESTIYA Special Correspondent Reports from Kabul"]

[Excerpts] Even after suffering a "strategic fiasco" in the 3-week battle for Jalalabad the rebels, despite heavy losses, have not given up their plans to capture this city. In recent days Jalalabad has been subjected to heavy shelling, which has resulted in casualties among the population. The government forces' artillery has carried out retaliatory strikes against areas where the rebels are based. According to the BAKHTAR News Agency, the dead include four military instructors from Saudi Arabia. [passage omitted]

I was told at the republic Ministry of Defense that the opposition's information services are trying to present Gulbuddin Hikmatyar, leader of the "irreconcilables," as a hero of the fighting for Jalalabad, claiming that he has been wounded in the area. However, according to information available to the competent Afghan organs, Hikmatyar was in fact slightly hurt during a clash with rival groupings on Pakistani territory.

Preparations for a provocation involving the killing of former Soviet servicemen near Jalalabad has once again focused attention on our POW's. Is there any more news about them?

D. Petitmermet, representative of the International Red Cross Committee in Kabul, told journalists that the International Red Cross Committee is trying to gain access to the POW's and is seeking permission for them to write home. The situation is complicated by the fact that there is no accurate information as to the whereabouts of the captured Soviet servicemen. Another problem is that representatives of the opposition have stated more than once that they are prepared to enter into negotiations about an exchange of prisoners only after they have captured Kabul. I would like to assure your readers that the matter of the POW's is now one of the main tasks in the work of our organization in Afghanistan, he said. [passage omitted]

'Arafat Named President of Palestine

PLO Central Council Unanimous

LD0204104689 Moscow TASS in English 1024 GMT 2 Apr 89

[Text] Tunis April 2 TASS—Yasir 'Arafat was named the president of the State of Palestine by the Central Council of the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO) at a session in the Tunisian capital.

He is known to have been appointed to the post by the PLO Executive Committee several days earlier.

According to official Palestinian sources, 'Arafat's candidacy was approved unanimously during voting in the Central Council.

'Arafat Political Adviser Comments

LD0204213689 Moscow TASS in English 2115 GMT 2 Apr 89

[Text] Tunis April 3 TASS—Bassam Abu Sharif, the political adviser of Yasir 'Arafat, who was endorsed on April 2 as president of the State of Palestine, held a news conference at the end of the meeting of the Central Council of Palestine (a steering group which acts when the Palestine National Council is not in session.)

Abu Sharif said that the election of Yasir 'Arafat as the first president of the Palestinian state was the most important outcome of the meeting. That decision, he stressed, has special significance. All Palestinian forces unanimously voted to elect 'Arafat as president, thus expressing complete trust to him. The opposition, Abu Sharif said, expressed its view which deviates from 'Arafat's line. Nevertheless, all of them supported his candidature.

The idea of electing a president is politically important. It is a new step in the struggle of the Palestine Liberation Organisation for a state of Palestine. This underscores the seriousness of the Palestinians' intention to continue efforts to achieve a just peace in the Middle East, Abu Sharif said.

As President Yasir 'Arafat will control all, primarily political, activity of the Palestinian people. These wide powers were granted to him by the entire Palestinian people. The new quality will create additional possibilities in Yasir 'Arafat's efforts to free the occupied territories and pave the way for an international peace conference on the Middle East.

The meeting of the PLO Central Council condemned the Israeli policy and terror against Palestinians. Abu Sharif stressed that the Israeli occupation troops raided Palestinian settlements and daily violated human rights on the occupied lands within the framework of the "iron fist" policy. The PLO Central Council also studied ways and means of stepping up civilian resistance to the occupation troops and drafted PLO recommendations on giving aid and perfecting guidance of Intifada—the popular uprising on the occupied Palestinian lands.

The PLO Central Council discussed details of the Soviet initiatives on the Middle East. Eduard Shevardnadze conducted important political work to solve the Middle East problem, Bassam Abu Sharif noted. He expressed the hope that the Soviet Union would continue its positive efforts to convince all sides involved in the conflict of the need for peaceful solution. "We are convinced that coordination between the PLO, the Soviet Union and all sides involved will yield positive results because only negotiations can lead to a comprehensive peace."

Bassam Abu Sharif noted that the Palestinian-U.S. dialogue would continue as part of the efforts to find the best possible ways of holding the international peace conference. "We hope that the international community will take advantage of the current favorable conditions for settling the Middle Eastern problem."

The Palestinian spokesman pointed out that contacts with the democratic and progressive forces of Israel had brought positive results in the past months. "We hope that cooperation between Palestinians and Israelis could be extended in future."

Abu Sharif said that the PLO Executive Council was instructed to perform the functions of the provisional government of Palestine until it is officially formed at appropriate time and in appropriate conditions.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Deputy Foreign Minister Adamishin in Zimbabwe

Meets Zimbabwean Leader Mugabe

LD3103195789 Moscow TASS in English 1939 GMT 31 Mar 89

[Text] Harare March 31 TASS—Zimbabwean President Robert Mugabe received on Friday Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Anatoliy Adamishin, who is making a tour of several southern African countries. The leader of the Zimbabwe African National Union-Patriotic Front (ZANU-PF) and the Soviet envoy held a substantive exchange of views on new developments in the area.

Special attention was paid to the need to end hostilities in Mozambique, which calls for a halt to all outside aid to armed bandits, to complete political settlement in southwestern Africa in line with the well known agreements, ensure genuine independence for Namibia and hold fair and just elections in that country. The dynamics of advance to the comprehensive settlement in southern Africa depend to a considerable degree on concerted efforts of the "Front-Line" states, all opponents of apartheid and racism, peace forces. In this connection the Soviet side laid special emphasis on the importance of efforts and possibilities of the Nonaligned Movement.

Robert Mugabe expressed satisfaction with Soviet support for the struggle of "Front-Line" states and the national-liberation movements aimed at eliminating the vestiges of colonial rule, promoting peace and stability in southern Africa in the interests of free, democratic and independent development of all nations there.

They also discussed the situation in and around Afghanistan which calls for an end to the bloodshed and interference in its internal affairs, primarily by Pakistan. Robert Mugabe highly assessed the fact that the Soviet Union matches its words with deeds. The Soviet Union fulfilled its obligations under Geneva agreements, and the other participants should do the same, the president stressed.

Vows Aid for 'Liberation Struggle'

LD0104125689 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1205 GMT 1 Apr 89

[Text] Harare, 1 Apr (TASS)—The Soviet Union will continue to render assistance to the liberation struggle of the people of South Africa in complete accordance with the position of the UN Organization, which declared apartheid a crime against humanity. This was stated by USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Anatoliy Adamishin at a press conference in Harare after he completed a tour of a number of countries of the region. In the course of the tour he held talks with the leaders of those countries and also with the leaders of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) and the Southwest African People's Organization (SWAPO).

The USSR is not a supporter of armed struggle for national liberation when there exists an opportunity to use peaceful means, the deputy minister noted. In his words, positive changes have occurred of late in the south of the African Continent. They were caused by general changes in the international situation, for which the movement toward peaceful solution of all regional conflicts is characteristic nowadays.

Apartheid in the Republic of South Africa can also be dismantled by peaceful means, but in order to do that all parties concerned should make appropriate concessions. As long as South African authorities continue to pursue a policy of violence, no one has a right to demand that people do not respond to it by violence, the Soviet representative said.

Promises Continued Arms to ANC

MB0104051889 Johannesburg SAPA in English 1952 GMT 31 Mar 89

[Text] Harare March 31 SAPA—The Soviet first deputy foreign affairs minister, Mr Anatoliy Adamishin, today said his country was the only major source of weapons for the African National Congress (ANC) and would continue supplying it.

"Those who think we are going to stop supplying the ANC with arms to force it into negotiations are engaging in wishful thinking," Mr Adamishin said, ZIANA national news agency reports.

The Soviet Union, he said, had no need to pressure the ANC into negotiating because the "liberation movement" was prepared to enter into political dialogue to resolve the South African conflict, and it had repeatedly made this clear, but the South African Government was not prepared to talk to it.

He pointed out that the Pretoria regime was calling on the ANC to renounce violence before it could be considered a negotiating partner, but the Pretoria regime itself was practising state violence against its own citizens as well as against internally and externally based leaders of the ANC, who were either imprisoned or hunted down all over the world.

"The South African authorities describe the ANC as a terrorist organisation," he said, "But nobody could argue that the regime was not practising state violence with detentions and suppression of anybody who did not agree with it."

When the regime said that the ANC should renounce violence, he said, the liberation movement replied that the SA [South African] Government should also renounce state-sponsored violence.

Mr Adamishin said the biggest number of capital punishments anywhere in the world was being carried out in South Africa, and the state had to give up violence first before it could ask the ANC to do so.

"Who can tell the people not to reciprocate to violence with violence," he asked.

Mr Adamishin said when South Africa, with whom the Soviets had contacts, accused his country of supplying arms to the ANC, "we tell them to stop state violence, come to the negotiating table with the ANC, abolish apartheid and grant legitimate rights to the black people in South Africa.

"The Soviet Union will continue to render assistance to the liberation movements in full compliance with the decisions of the international community and the United Nations which have declared apartheid a crime against humanity."

He said that "it takes two to tango" and if those who wanted a political solution were answered with violence, then they had the right to answer with arms.

However, Mr Adamishin said his country did not champion armed struggle as a way of achieving national liberation if more peaceful ways could be found. He said there was positive change in the southern African region, just as there was in the world, with political rather than military solutions being sought to end regional conflicts.

"First we have the better situation in the world. There is movement towards political settlement of all regional conflicts in the world. We began the process with our withdrawal from Afghanistan," he said.

Citing the accord which led to the Namibian independence exercise which begins tomorrow, Mr Adamishin said nobody could have thought that a political solution would be reached. It had only been possible because all the concerned parties had been committed to reaching an agreement, and each had made concessions.

In similar vein he believed it was possible to dismantle apartheid by peaceful means, but only if all sides were willing to make concessions.

"For this it is necessary that all sides make concessions. The other side should seriously consider its responsibility if things are heading for a clash. We champion the peaceful road but not the unjust road.

"I just hope that all the South African leaders have enough common sense to do this. I very much hope so because the alternative—well, you know it," Mr Adamishin said.

There had been some positive changes in South Africa but these had not addressed the main issue—power sharing. The main causes for the changes were South Africa's defeat at the battle of Cuito Cuanavale in Angola, changes in the international situation and the southern African region, international public opinion, sanctions and South Africa's increasing ostracisation from the civilised world, and to break out of its isolation. South Africa was contemplating dismantling apartheid.

"We have contacts with the so-called liberal whites. Apartheid is a burden for them, the age of apartheid is almost gone and everybody senses this, including the South African leadership," he said.

"It is the desire of many people in South Africa to introduce changes. One cannot deny that in doing away with racial segregation there are some positive developments but democratisation and power sharing—I do not see any cardinal changes—and those who oppose the regime on this are suppressed," Mr Adamishin said.

South Africa was also aware that it would accelerate its own development if it abolished apartheid, he said.

Mr Adamishin said there was no coordination between his country and the United Kingdom as far as policy on southern Africa was concerned, but did not rule out any future collaboration between not only the two, but all members of the UN Security Council and African countries in seeking a solution to the South African conflict to bring peace to the region.

He also refused to rule out the possibility of his country playing a mediating role, provided it was asked by both the South African Government and the ANC.

On the question of his country selling fighter aircraft to Zimbabwe, Mr Adamishin said there was no agreement between the two countries to this effect.

"But I would like to confirm Zimbabwe's right to approach us for arms and our right to sell to them," Mr Adamishin said.

He also said Moscow's position on sanctions against South Africa was closer to that adopted by President Robert Mugabe, who was in favour of a comprehensive package.

"This does not mean that because Mr Mugabe and ourselves are for sanctions, we are opposed to political dialogue. The effects of sanctions will actually help that dialogue," Mr Adamishin said.

"Sanction, yes. But a political solution in this region is possible."

Adamishin, Officials Review Namibia Issue

LD0204101889 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1350 GMT 1 Apr 89

["International" program captioned: "Problem in Focus, the Road to Peace in Southwest Africa," presented by international affairs journalist Vladimir Grigoriyev, with Andrey Yuriyevich Urnov, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department; and Anatoliy Leonidovich Adamishin, deputy foreign minister; video shows participants sitting around table in studio holding discussion, interspersed with documentary footage]

[Excerpts] [Grigoriyev] The issue of a settlement in southwest Africa has switched from the sphere of theory and discussion to the stage of practical resolution. The road toward this was very lengthy and very hard. We would like to discuss this in our program today. [passage omitted]

[Adamishin] The history of the conflict shows that the Republic of South Africa [RSA] has used every pretext it can to avoid leaving Namibia. And the Americans gave it a good safety-valve here when they said that, yes, the RSA must leave Namibia, but because the Cuban troops, which were allegedly a threat to the security of the RSA, were in Angola, the only circumstance under which Namibia could be granted its independence was if the Cubans left Angola. From the point of view of international law, this was nonsense, an absurdity. The RSA should have left Namibia long before the Cubans went into Angola, and, what is more, it should have left Namibia even before Angola gained independence if it was to comply with the decisions of the international community. But when our Angolan and Cuban friends began negotiations with the RSA, through the mediation of the United States, they also brought into this general equation the issue of the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. Thus, it was what can be called a goodwill gesture on their part in order to find a constructive solution to the problem.

[Urnov] [passage omitted] One cannot, of course, fail to mention that the changes for the better that have taken shape in southwest Africa have occurred in the context of a general warming of the internatonal situation, with the principles of new thinking beginning to be affirmed in world politics and with an increased inclination toward the search for a political solution to conflicts, the search for mutually acceptable compromises. Both Cuba and Angola have demonstrated a constructive and flexible attitude. Soviet-U.S. cooperation has become possible. And as a result of the influence of this whole collection of factors, success was achieved in the form of what we see today.

[Adamishin] Perhaps we should not forget the international pressure on the RSA as a whole, and the general atmosphere of international ostracism in which the country obviously feels uncomfortable—and it is a rather big country with developed industry. The awareness that you can't ride a torpedo very far under these circumstances, all of this taken together, this whole collection of factors, including the internationalist efforts, have brought about a situation in which common sense has started to show through in the RSA.

[Grigoriyev] Anatoliy Leonidovich, as far as I know there has been a total of 11 rounds of settlement negotiations, and at the final stage representatives of our Foreign Ministry attended as observers. You were also present at some of the meetings. Could you tell us your assessments and observations on these talks?

[Adamishin] Well, it must be said that our so-called unofficial observers attended all the rounds of the negotiations, and not just the closing stages. We joined this process actively from the very beginning. But I think we should start with the new role our country is generally playing in international relations. Andrey Yuriyevich mentioned this—the new thinking, the inclination toward political settlements, and so on. A negotiating process is, of course, a collective labor. But I think it can be said without having to stretch the point at all that were it not for the role played by our country in the broad context of international affairs, and in this particular case for a regional settlement, I think there would have been no accord. Thus, our role here was integral.

As is known, the talks were conducted between Angola and Cuba, on the one hand, and the RSA, on the other, through the mediation of the United States. Moreover, the United States was picked as intermediary by Angola and Cuba themselves. It was not an issue for us that the United States was the mediator: It was important for us that that an agreement on the substance of the matter be reached. It had to be a just settlement. And what sort of settlement did we and do we regard as just? An agreement that meets the interests of Angola, the South-West African People's Organization [SWAPO], and Cuba. We didn't need any additional advantages. I think that this broad approach of ours played a very considerable role in the attainment of a settlement.

I would mention the vast amount of work done outside the framework of the negotiations. The issues were repeatedly discussed by our leaders with our friends, with whom we were in constant contact, with the non-aligned and frontline states, with the United States, with India, and so on. In the end, at the actual rounds of the negotiating table, maintaining contact with all the parties to the talks—it must be stated flatly that our unofficial observers also maintained contact with the RSA—we tried to exert an active influence toward ensuring that the talks proceeded in the required direction. Ours was an exclusively gentlemanly role, in this sense. We did not give our friends advice on how to conduct the negotiations—they did this very well or their own—but we assisted in ensuring that a settlement was achieved. I think it can be said that as a result all the parties to the talks, including the U.S. intermediaries, put a high value on the Soviet Union's role.

[Grigoriyev] Immediately after the agreement was signed in New York on 22 December, the magazine JEUNE AFRIQUE published a statement that the date set by the agreements—1 April—could have been much earlier. It is well-known that the RSA promised to implement Resolution 435 from 1 November, and then 1 January, and now the date of 1 April has been fixed. What is the cause of this?

[Adamishin] There is no question but that in a number of instances the RSA behaved in an obstructionist manner. It is enough to recall the talks in Brazzaville, when it seemed that the protocol to be signed in Brazzaville a couple of weeks later could already be signed: At the very last moment, the RSA delegation slammed the door and went back home, and this held up the negotiating process. But I don't think it is quite accurate to say that the RSA promised something. The dates figured in the negotiating process. When it proved impossible to attain the relevant agreement by a certain deadline, the date was put back. I would not overdramatize the fact that there was a few months' difference. If one can really blame the RSA for something, it is that it failed to fulfill the UN decisions for several decades! That one can do!

[Grigoriyev] Another question for you, Anatoliy Leonidovich. The agreement has been signed. The deadlines and dates for the decolonization of Namibia have been signed. How will it look in practice?

[Adamishin] Two agreements were signed in New York on 22 December. The first was a tripartite agreement among the RSA, Angola, and Cuba. This agreement laid the foundation for the granting of Namibian independence and put into effect a plan that had been agreed on back in 1978. In other words, the questions of the withdrawal of RSA troops from Namibia were not discussed at the talks. This is because they had already been agreed to in the 10-year-old plan of 1978. The pullout of RSA troops from Namibia starts from 1 April. Within 7 months, in other words by the time of the elections in Namibia, there should effectively be no RSA troops left there, not counting the military base they have kept for themselves for the time being under the same plan. At the same time, in accordance with the UN plan, UN military and civilian personnel are being brought in to see to it that the elections really are just. Admittedly, it can be said in advance that all sorts of attempts will be made by the RSA to influence the result of the elections one way or another. This is the upshot of the agreements. The UN plan, under which the RSA is to withdraw its troops from Namibia, is being put into effect. Elections to the constituent assembly are being held in Namibia. And subsequently its independence is to be proclaimed no later than 1 April 1990. In other words, effectively in a little over a year the last blot of colonialism should be wiped off the map of Africa.

A bilateral agreement was also signed in New York between Angola and Cuba concerning the timetable for the pullout of Cuban troops from Angola, and their withdrawal from the border with Namibia. A complicated system has been worked out. There is a month-by-month timetable according to which troops are to be moved to the north, beyond the 13th and 15th parallels, and so on. This will be taking place up to 1 July 1991. Incidentally, the linkage was broken here in practice. Under the UN plan, the RSA is to leave Namibia considerably earlier than the Cuban troops are to leave Angola.

[Urnov] [passage omitted] There are no signs at the moment that a flight of capital from Namibia is being prepared. Of course, if, for example, the RSA, dissatisfied with the election results, starts something in the nature of an economic war against Namibia, the situation will not be simple. The proposition that Namibia is totally dependent on the RSA does not fuly correspond with the facts. This proposition is deliberately stressed, blown up, and hyped by the RSA with the intention of intimidating voters. There is already a large number of independent states in southern Africa. Take Botswana, for instance, whose economy is very much dependent on the RSA: The country's leadership still manages to find ways and means to ensure its own sovereignty and independence. Lately, it has even experienced not bad economic growth.

[Adamishin] It seems to me that it depends on what sort of line is adopted by the RSA. There are realistic people in the RSA, and there are, of course, also people who do not want to let go of this morsel at any price. If a hard line prevails—and given the change of leadership that is currently under way in the RSA this is a viable possibility, generally speaking—there could be a lengthy period of instability, confusion, and possibly even civil war there.

[Grigoriyev] Anatoliy Leonidovich, I should like to deal with Angola a bit further. It is well known that when Angola's internal situation is discussed, the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola [UNITA]—the anti-Angolan terrorist grouping destablizing the country—cannot be ignored. Under the agreement struck in New York, the RSA has pledged to halt all support for the UNITA grouping, while Chester Crocker, the U.S. representative at the talks, immediately declared that the U.S.A. would continue to render all possible diplomatic and military support to UNITA. How are those words to be regarded in light of the accords?

[Urnov] Negatively, of course. All in all, the U.S. attitude towards UNITA testifies to the duality of the policy the United States is currently pursuing in southwest Africa. On the one hand, there is what would seem to be the positive influence on, or, to be more exact, assistance in, the process of trilateral negotiations, in the RSA's pullout from Angola [as heard], and the implementation of Resolution 435; and on the other hand, the most crass interference in the affairs of Angola by backing UNITA. The United States has always supported UNITA—from the very beginning. It was a sort of Trojan horse in Angola's nationalist movement that failed completely to give a good account of itself during the struggle against Portuguese colonialism, and if it did give an account of itself it was a negative one because of its ties with the Portuguese colonialists. The United States helped UNITA, but covertly, and it always denied this help. When Reagan's Republican administration came to office, ties began to be expanded, although they continued to be denied. The reason was that the U.S. Congress had at one time passed a law prohibiting the government from supporting UNITA. When Reagan came to power and became President, his administration mounted a campaign to have the amendment repealed. And after the amendment was indeed repealed, the U.S. Administration started to help UNITA overtly, on an ever-increasing scale, and this included the supply of modern weapons. Now it has reached the stage where the United States admits fairly openly that in a situation where RSA aid is being reduced, U.S. aid is essentially a decisive condition of [UNITA's] existence. This sort of action does not, of course, fit into any framework of international law. The result is a contradictory picture, with the United States appearing to be extinguishing the flames with one hand, and yet at the same time attempting to fan the flames in the same region with the other. Such actions do not contribute to a settlement; they do not contribute to peace in the country. Of that there is no doubt.

[Adamishin] I'd like to add that what we have here, I believe, is an ideologically motivated approach, pure and simple. After all, the Angolan Government is ready for normal relations with the United States. It already has economic ties with U.S. monopolies. The oil extracted in Angola—three-quarters of it, or more—goes to the United States. In other words, it can't be said that the Angolan Government holds a vigorously unfriendly position toward the United States and that the United States, by supporting the UNITA antigovernment grouping, would like to change the policy of the Angolan Government. But it must be said that the Angolan Government has placed its stake on a peaceful solution to the domestic problems that exist inside the country. They do have problems, and a solution to them must be sought. And the Angolan Government has adopted a policy of tackling these problems by political means, not military ones. There can be no military solution to the problem, and the Angolans themselves told me—it was an excellent argument, I thought—that if a military solution existed, we would have found it 13 years ago!

[Grigoriyev] So the settlement process in southwest Africa is entering its decisive phase. But will it be taken to a conclusion? I believe this is by no means a rhetorical question. It has already been noted in our program today, and it is a well-known fact, that the RSA has on numerous occasions violated the accords and obligations it has taken upon itself. Thus, only time will tell whether the security of Angola and noninterference in the internal affairs of Namibia will be fully guaranteed. I believe that one thing is clear—much, if not everything, here depends on the goodwill of all the sides with an interest in the resolution of this protracted conflict.

[Video shows the three participants seated in a studio, with discussion constantly accompanied by footage on various points raised in the course of the program: UN proceedings, Cuban troops being given a sendoff in Angola, South African police dispersing black demonstrators, South African troops in the Bush, Sam Nujoma among his supporters, South African attack on Cuito Cuanavale, South African street scenes, officials at negotiations on southwest Africa, signing of Namibia and Cuban pullout accords, mining operations in Namibia, UNITA forces in the bush country]

West Europe

Reportage on Gorbachev's 2 Apr Stopover in Ireland

Irish Prime Minister Previews Visit

PM0204165589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 2 Apr 89 Second Edition p 5

[Interview with Irish Prime Minister Charles Haughey by Sergey Oleynik, TASS correspondent in Dublin: "Sources of Optimism and Disappointment"; Haughey's comments submitted as "written replies to TASS questions," according to report on this interview carried by Moscow TASS in English at 1958 GMT on 31 March; first paragraph is SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA introduction;]

[Text] On his way to Cuba on 2 April, M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, will stopover briefly at Ireland's Shannon Airport, where he will be greeted by Charles Haughey, the Irish prime minister. This will be the first—albeit brief—Soviet-Irish summit. In this connection, Sergey Oleynik, TASS correspondent in Dublin, has interviewed the head of the Irish Government for SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA.

[Oleynik] A great deal has changed since the opening of the Soviet Embassy in Dublin in 1974. What is the official Irish view of relations between our countries on the eve of the first meeting between the two countries' leaders?

[Haughey] Our relations are developing satisfactorily. We have laid the foundations for their further development in the political and economic spheres. Unquestionably, there is potential for their further development, and we intend to make every effort to put these potential opportunities to the best possible use. In the political sphere I welcome the speech delivered by President Gorbachev last year at the UN General Assembly session. In many respects the approach to the United Nations reflected in that speech accords with Ireland's longstanding policy with regard to that international organization. This circumstance points to possibilities for cooperation between our two countries on problems confronting the whole world.

The joint Irish-Soviet venture launched with the participation of the Aer Rianta airline—the opening of a duty-free store at Moscow airport—is a good example of what can be done in the economic sphere.

[Oleynik] As you know, the Irish organization "Tipperary Peace Convention" recently awarded a peace prize to M.S. Gorbachev. In this context, do you agree with the view that the improvement of bilateral relations has found an expression in improved mutual understanding between our two peoples?

[Haughey] The policy under which Soviet society is becoming an open society has enabled the Irish public to gain a better idea about the problems confronting the Soviet Union. The policy of economic and political restructuring being implemented by President Gorbachev has led to a better understanding by the Irish public of the Soviet leadership's approach to the solution of these problems. The greater openness in the Soviet system means that the Irish people are now much better informed about life in the Soviet Union, and this is very pleasing. I am not just thinking about the information we obtain from the press—that, too, is important, of course; I am also referring to contacts between people; and such contacts, thanks to the easing of the conditions on which they are based, have improved considerably. This applies to Irish people's trips to the Soviet Union and visits to Ireland by Soviet people. The expansion of contacts and available information, and consequently the achievement of better understanding—these, too, are events that are to be welcomed.

[Oleynik] Ireland was among the first countries to sign the nuclear nonproliferation treaty. At the UN General Assembly and at other international forums Ireland has repeatedly called for the total elimination of nuclear weapons. Recently, thanks to the joint efforts of the United States and the USSR, with the support of the entire world community, important progress was achieved: the treaty on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles was ratified. What should the next steps be, in your opinion?

[Haughey] It is perfectly obvious that the next step toward ending and reversing the nuclear arms race must be the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban treaty. Only by means of a total test ban will it be possible to end the development of new mass annihilation weapons. It must be said that the limited test ban agreements concluded so far have not put an end to the nuclear arms race or seriously curbed the development and further improvement of nuclear weapons. Therefore, Ireland invariably supports the conclusion of a total test ban treaty at the earliest possible date; we regard this as the first and most important step toward disarmament. The earliest possible conclusion of such a treaty would be the most cogent proof of the resolve of states that possess nuclear weapons to bring the arms race under control. The conclusion of such a treaty does not seem feasible in the near future, and this is a source of disappointment for Ireland.

Ireland believes that it is also vitally important to end the deployment of new nuclear arms. The joint U.S. and Soviet aim of cutting their strategic nuclear arms stockpiles by 50 percent is undoubtedly very important, and we hope that it will be possible to resume the talks in this sphere in the near future and bring them to a successful conclusion. However, it is perfectly obvious that even a reduction of nuclear arms on this scale will fail to produce a long-term impact if the remaining warheads are improved and turned into an even more sophisticated means of nuclear war and annihilation. Therefore, it is important, in the nearest future, to end the development of new nuclear arms and delivery vehicles in order to ensure that the reductions in the nuclear arsenals result, without fail, in the total elimination of all nuclear arms. As you noted quite rightly, Ireland is firmly committed to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty.

However, despite the fact that this treaty has now been signed by some 140 countries, a quite substantial number of countries, including some countries with known nuclear ambitions, have still not acceded to the treaty.

[Oleynik] On 1 January 1990 Ireland will take up chairmanship of the European Community. What is your opinion of the prospects for expansion and diversification of relations between the EEC and the USSR?

[Haughey] Considerable progress has clearly been achieved in EEC-USSR relations over a short period of time and, because we started virtually from scratch, considerable potential exists for their further improvement. I am pleased to note that the USSR has recently appointed a representative to the European Community, and this will assist the development of relations. The two sides have embarked on discussion of a general framework for agreements on trade and cooperation, and also on fisheries and textiles, which will provide a firm foundation for the further development of relations. These are developments that we in Ireland welcome and which we will support, especially during the time Ireland chairs the European Community.

[Oleynik] As you know, Aer Rianta and Aeroflot have set up the first Soviet-Irish joint venture. In light of the economic reforms under way in the USSR, do you view future Irish-Soviet trade relations with optimism?

[Haughey] The Irish Government welcomed the establishment in February 1988 of "Aerofirst," the first Irish-Soviet joint enterprise, set up by the Irish airline Aer Rianta and Aeroflot.

We in Ireland are closely following the process of restructuring currently under way in the USSR. We believe that the implementation of restructuring will open up new opportunities for mutual cooperation. We believe that Ireland has much to offer not just in terms of goods but also in terms of professional knowhow and services. We are interested in expanding the sphere of our economic relations and, in our opinion, conditions are now being created in which such an expansion can take place. Therefore, I optimistically assess possibilities for the development of economic relations between our two countries.

USSR-Ireland Ties Previewed

PM0204175589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
2 Apr 89 Second Edition p 1

[Correspondent T. Kolesnichenko dispatch: "A Step Forward Rather Than a Stopover. Before the Soviet-Irish Summit"]

[Text] Dublin, 1 Apr— It is as if spring was emphasizing Ireland's national color—green. Dublin, bathed in sunlight, is sprucing up, as it were. It would be no exaggeration to say that the main topic discussed in the local press and by what is referred to as "the man in the street" is the upcoming Soviet-Irish summit, the first such meeting in the history of our states. "A step forward rather than a stopover en route to Cuba"—this was the theme of an important Irish radio broadcast, which noted that M.S. Gorbachev is not just "stopping over for an hour at Shannon airport, but will be holding important talks there with Irish Prime Minister Charles Haughey."

The announcment that this summit meeting was to take place was an unexpected but very pleasant surprise for the Irish. It is being linked directly with the policy of new thinking which, it can be claimed, has made this meeting between the leaders of the Soviet Union and Ireland possible. Emphasis on reason rather than force, and the perception of the world in all its diversity and unity have enhanced the role of small countries in international politics and enabled them to participate on equal terms in dialogue on the most crucial problems facing all mankind.

In this respect the Soviet-Irish dialogue has a firm basis and favorable prospects. Ireland was one of the initiators of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and vigorously favors the treaty's full implementation. It is opposed to testing and modernization of these means of mass annihilation, rates highly the treaty on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles, welcomes Soviet-U.S. negotiations on 50-percent cuts in nuclear arsenals, and favors implementation of the idea of a comprehensive nuclear weapons test ban treaty as an important step toward real disarmament.

People in Ireland greatly appreciate the Soviet Union's policy in the international arena and its foreign policy initiatives. This applies at both the state and public level. An example of this is the peace prize conferred on M.S. Gorbachev by the prestigious Irish "Tipperary Peace Convention" organization, which proclaimed the Soviet leader "man of the year."

There have been difficult times in our bilateral relations, but today nothing is casting a shadow on them; on the contrary, they are being filled with a new content. The revolutionary changes taking place in our country have served as the stimulus for this. Glasnost and the democratization of Soviet society are evoking great interest here. I was able to see this for myself. Frankly, I did not expect to hear heated discussions and arguments in Dublin, which is far from Moscow, about the elections that have just taken place in the Soviet Union.

Today Ireland is an active trading partner of the Soviet Union. There is much that we can learn from this country. The livestock raising sector is very strong here. In terms of the number of cattle raised per capita and of live exports of stock, Ireland is first in Europe. The grain problem has been entirely solved here, livestock feed requirements are met from domestic resources, and that is so despite the fact that only 30 percent of arable land is allocated to grain. We buy meat and dairy products, leather raw materials, and so forth from Ireland. The USSR supplies petrochemical and chemical goods, machinery, and equipment to Ireland. It is also of great importance that since 1977 annual sessions of the Soviet-Irish joint intergovernmental commission have taken place alternately in Moscow and Dublin at which the prospects of the further development of relations between our countries are discussed.

As the Irish prime minister announced recently, a cultural agreement between our countries is ready for signing. With every passing year more musicians and artists from the USSR and Ireland exchange creative visits (including the Bolshoy and Kirov ballets). Last year, for instance, 62 Soviet delegations visited this country, and 88 Irish delegations visited the Soviet Union. Thus, the dialogue between our countries is taking place at various levels including students, representatives of trade unions and other public organizations, and young people.

Naturally, everyone expects that the meeting at Shannon will open up even greater prospects for the development of our bilateral relations. And so Ireland's attention is focused on Shannon. It is no accident that the local press is describing the meeting between our leaders at the airport as historic.

Haughey Greets Gorbachev

PM0304093589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
3 Apr 89 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report under the general heading: "M.S. Gorbachev's Departure for Cuba"]

[Text] Greeting M.S. Gorbachev and R.M. Gorbacheva, the Irish prime minister said:

Welcome to Ireland!

You are the first Soviet president ever to visit Ireland and that is why your visit is historic. This meeting will give us a chance to exchange views with you on international relations and also on the developing relations between our two countries.

There are numerous opportunities for our economic and cultural bilateral relations to develop successfully. We consider it appropriate to especially point out these opportunities here at this international airport, which reaches across all Europe linking the Volga with the Shannon and does a great deal to reveal the potential for cooperation with the Soviet Union.

Together with other countries of the world, Ireland is following the radical changes now under way in the Soviet Union with great understanding and sympathy. We profoundly respect your efforts to open up Soviet society and restructure the Soviet Union's economic and political system, and we wish you success in your courageous endeavors.

Your initiatives have made a great contribution to the new spirit of cooperation with the United States, to relieving international tension, and to confidence-building. People of goodwill throughout the world are glad that we are gradually escaping a state of tension where force alone is valued and moving on to a new world where political concepts and dialogue play a central role. There is now a real possibility of a further reduction in the terrible burden of nuclear weapons and further progress in resolving dangerous regional conflicts.

Your historic speech at the UN General Assembly on 7 December marked with great clarity a new approach to world problems. The role that you attribute to the United Nations—"that unique instrument"—coincides in many respects with my homeland's age-old policy. International security based on various countries' observance of laws and on the cessation of the arms race is necesary for the future of mankind. I would like to express our desire to implement these ideals in the words of the popular Russian poet Sergey Yesenin: "It is because they live with me on earth that people are dear to me."

I personally hope that our mutual economic and cultural relations will broaden and deepen. I believe that all countries, both great and small, can contribute to the new "tide" of peaceful cooperation throughout the world. I hope that the hope you voiced in your book "Restructuring and the New Thinking for Our Country and the Entire World" will come true: "That freedom will reign in every corner of the earth this next century."

On behalf of the entire Irish people, I welcome you to Ireland one hundred thousand times, as we say in Ireland.

Gorbachev Speaks on Arrival

LD0204115989 Moscow TASS in English 1157 GMT 2 Apr 89

[Text] Shannon, Ireland, April 2 TASS—Today Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev arrived at Ireland's Shannon Airport on his way from Moscow to Havana.

He was met by Irish Prime Minister Charles Haughey and other officials.

[Moscow TASS International Service in Russian at 1425 GMT on 2 April carries a report that says: "M.S. Gorbachev and his wife and entourage were met at the airport, which was decorated with the state flags of the Irish Republic and the Soviet Union, by C. Haughey, prime minister of Ireland; B. Lenihan, deputy prime minister and minister of foreign affairs; A. Reynolds, minister of finance; J. Wilson, minister of tourism and transport; other members of the Cabinet; C.V. Whelan, Irish ambassador to the USSR; and G.V. Uranov, USSR ambassador to Ireland."]

Charles Haughey addressed the Soviet leader upon his arrival. In response Gorbachev said:

Mr. Prime Minister, ladies and gentlemen,

We are glad to be here on Irish soil. Thank you for the warm reception and for your kind words. Through you we salute a country with a centuries-old history and culture, a country whose sons and daughters have made a contribution to the development of many countries on all continents. We salute the brave and gifted people of Ireland.

On the calendar of our meetings with the leaders of a number of countries to be held this year, Ireland is not a stopover but a milestone. The first Soviet-Irish summit meeting will be brief. But that makes every minute of it even more important. We appreciate the opportunity to discuss with you, Mr. Prime Minister, problems that are of equal concern to all of us—global, European, and bilateral.

In shaping our policies in today's increasingly interrelated world, we take into account the views of all states. For us, dialogue with representatives of any country—whether big, medium-sized, or small—is a dialogue of equals. That is the only possible basis for productive decisions consistent with the goals of strengthening security and trust and developing mutually beneficial cooperation.

The intensification of international dialogue, the affirmation of the new political thinking, and revolutionary changes in our country are not merely concurrent processes. They reinforce each other in helping make the world at the threshold of the 21st century better, safer, and more just. We hope that discussions with our Irish hosts will be precisely about that.

We are committed to dynamic Soviet-Irish relations in all areas.

Haughey, Gorbachev Hold Talks

LD0204143289 Moscow TASS in English 1429 GMT 2 Apr 89

[Excerpt] Shannon, Ireland April 2 TASS—By TASS special correspondent:

A Soviet-Irish summit meeting was held here today. Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev made a brief, two-hour-long stopover here on his way to Cuba where he is going for an official friendly visit at the invitation of Cuban leader Fidel Castro Ruz.

Speaking at the close of the summit, Irish Prime Minister Charles Haughey pointed out that bilateral relations, developments in Europe, and other international problems were discussed during a very interesting and stimulating conversation.

The prime minister said unity of views on a whole number of issues discussed was shown, and that it was agreed that a delegation of Irish ministers would travel to Moscow with a view to discussing possibilities for further development of bilateral contacts.

Mikhail Gorbachev, who spoke next, described the talks as "substantive". They, the Soviet leader said, enabled the two sides to set out their positions and compare assessments on a wide range of matters concerning bilateral relations, international issues, including such topical ones as the European process, and regional conflicts, the one in the Middle East, in particular.

Gorbachev pointed out that the constructive thrust and the good atmosphere of the talks moved the Soviet-Irish political dialogue to a higher level and that this was a dialogue with greater trust and mutual understanding.

I believe that we compared time on the political clock in Moscow and in Ireland and I believe that this comparison has been very useful, the Soviet leader emphasized.

An impromptu news conference was held before Gorbachev's departure for Havana. [passage omitted]

Leaders Make Statements on Talks

LD0204183689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 2 Apr 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] After the meeting at the airport, Soviet-Irish talks took place. [video shows talks: Haughey and unidentified individuals on one side; Gorbachev, Shevardnadze, Yakovlev, and Kamentsev on other side]

At the end of the Soviet-Irish talks, Charles Haughey and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev made brief statements at a news conference.

[Haughey in English, followed by Russian translation] The president and I, the president's colleagues and mine, have held very interesting talks. We touched upon matters of international importance, bilateral issues, developments in Europe and various other matters. We have agreed on some important problems and that they will be developed at ministry level, and that a delegation of Irish ministers will go to Moscow to develop contacts. In conclusion, I would like to say that for myself personally it has been a great honor that the president of the Soviet Union has come here, and I now wish to invite him to speak. Thank you.

[Gorbachev] I must repeat myself, because what Prime Minister Haughey has said coincides also with my evaluations of the talks that took place. They were substantive talks. Bearing in mind, obviously, the time that was scheduled for them, both sides were able to present their positions in a concentrated form and compare their evaluations on a wide range of international problems and bilateral relations, and also to touch upon such topical issues as the European process, regional conflicts, in particular the Middle East, and other problems. In my opinion, the good atmosphere and constructive thrust of the talks elevate the Soviet-Irish political dialogue to a higher level. There is more trust and mutual understanding in it, and we welcome this. The prime minister said correctly that we brought up topics that require further discussion and exchange of opinions, and we have agreed that a group of ministers will go to Moscow so that this exchange will be continued. It appears to me that our check on the Moscow and Irish political clocks was a useful one. Thank you.

[Announcer] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev then replied to journalists' questions. [video shows Haughey and Gorbachev addressing news conference]

Gorbachev Meets Press After Talks

LD0204184689 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1712 GMT 2 Apr 89

[Excerpts] Shannon, 2 Apr (TASS special correspondent)—A press briefing on the results of the Soviet-Irish summit meeting was held here today. [passage omitted]

M.S. Gorbachev replied to questions from journalists:

Question: Did you discuss the problem of Northern Ireland, and what is your point of view on this problem?

Answer: We leave this matter, on the basis of our philosophy, to the Irish. We see in the problem of Northern Ireland the human aspect, we take account of this, and we hope that a solution will be found that might meet the feelings and hopes of the people of Northern Ireland. I would like to say, once again, that we leave this matter to the Government of Great Britain. For this reason, we were unable to discuss this matter with the prime minister in practical terms. This is the internal affair of Great Britain.

Question: You have said that this meeting is not simply a stopover en route, but an event. I would like to ask what significance you attach to relations with Ireland, and what significance you attach to economic ties with Ireland and with the European Community from the point of view of restructuring.

Answer: In view of the shortage of time, I will answer in a few words. We consider that today many problems in the world have assumed such a nature that they affect the interests of all countries, and for this reason we are convinced that their solution is possible with the participation of all countries—large, small, and medium-sized. That is why we value cooperation with the Republic of Ireland and its government, and we value this dialogue. Furthermore, we see a great reserve of constructiveness in the Irish Government's position.

In addition, it must be borne in mind that we are Europeans. We consider that at this crucial stage Europe is called upon to play an immense and key role in the attainment of a new level of international relations. In this context, it seems to me that it is necessary to come to understand the European home in which we live, and to put this home in order. These processes are not only possible, they are already taking place and have a positive trend. We think that these processes will take place more successfully if all the countries of Europe as well as the United States of America and Canada take an active part in them.

We must proceed from the existing realities: CEMA exists, the European market exists, NATO exists, the Warsaw Treaty exists, and states with different systems exist. With these realities in mind, it is necessary to consolidate what is positive and reduce confrontation, above all, military confrontation. We are convinced that there are immense possibilities in Europe. If Europe moves forward in this respect, it will display an example of how it is necessary to act in order to arrive at a new character of international relations.

Question: Can you say when full religious freedom will be guaranteed in the Soviet Union within the scope of the policy of glasnost and restructuring?

Answer: It seems to me that this process is under way, as are all of the processes within the scope of restructuring, glasnost, and the development of democracy. Much has already changed; next in line is discussion in the new Supreme Soviet, when it is formed on the basis of the recently held elections, of a law on freedom of conscience.

Question: The small Irish town of Tipperary recently awarded you a peace prize. What is your reaction to this award?

Answer: I am very grateful to all those citizens of various countries who have, to one degree or another, responded to our invitation to cooperation, to the search for a better world, who have placed a high value on the initiatives of the Soviet state for changing the international situation for the better. Taking advantage of the opportunity, I give sincere thanks for this support and this high evaluation.

Gorbachev Departs for Cuba

LD0204125489 Moscow TASS in English 1250 GMT 2 Apr 89

[Text] Shannon, Ireland April 2 TASS—Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev left Ireland's Shannon Airport for Havana today.

He made a brief stopover here on his way to Cuba where he is going for an official friendly visit at the invitation of Cuban leader Fidel Castro Ruz.

Soviet-Irish summit talks were held at Shannon Airport.

During his departure for Havana Mikhail Gorbachev was seen off by Irish Prime Minister Charles Haughey and by other officials.

Paper Sums Up Meeting

PM0304091989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Apr 89 Second Edition p 2

["Soviet-Irish Summit"—PRAVDA headline]

[Text] In line with a previously reached agreement, talks were held 2 April at Shannon between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and Charles Haughey, prime minister of the Irish Republic.

Welcoming the Soviet visitor, Haughey stressed that Ireland views the processes going on in the USSR within the framework of restructuring, democratization, and economic and political reform with great interest and sympathy. They are of significance not just for the Soviet Union, but for a change for the better in the entire world atmosphere.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev expressed his thanks for this expression of solidarity. We see clearly the indissoluble link between the revolutionary tasks facing the Soviet Union at the present, crucial stage in her development, and the general state of the international climate. The progress of restructuring in the USSR is inseparable from the desire to advance in Europe and on the world scene the ideas of new political thinking that, as we see it, correspond to the interests of all peoples and states.

During the talks, issues concerning nuclear and conventional disarmament in Europe were touched upon, as were ways of settling regional conflicts—particularly in the Near East—and the prospects for the development of relations between the East and the West. There was coincidence or broad similarity in the standpoints of the Soviet Union and the Irish Republic on all these issues.

The prime minister remarked that, as a member of the EEC, Ireland plays an active role in drawing up the community's policy, and is doing all it possibly can to increase the pace of disarmament and promote an expansion of the dialogue between the EEC and CEMA. We are against the arms race, he said—not just because it presents a serious threat to peace, but because it is an insane waste of resources that could be used to resolve the urgent problems facing mankind, and, in particular, help the development of the Third World.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev was in complete agreement on this, stressing that the Soviet Union also sees the issues of disarmament and development as an organically unified whole.

There was an interesting exchange of opinions over the prospects for European development. The Irish prime minister emphasized that his colleagues and he advocate a broad development of links with the Eastern European countries. This approach is gathering momentum in Western Europe, which gives rise to the hope that the pan-European process will continue steadily both in the sense of strengthening security and political cooperation, and in the sense of developing mutually beneficial economic cooperation [kooperatsiya].

We are Europeans, said Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, and we view Europe as a continent that extends from the Atlantic to the Urals. In our opinion, the European process cannot be successful without the participation of all European states, the United States, and Canada. We must be realists, otherwise this will not be a fruitful political process but a scrap heap. We must see the existence of states with differing social systems, NATO and the Warsaw Pact, the CEMA and the EEC, and other elements of the European reality, and build the whole of policy in such a way as to strengthen the positive, mutually beneficial points and weaken the military confrontation and negative tendencies. In brief, proceeding from the realities, we must build, brick-by-brick, the European home, the idea of which seems to be finding broader and broader recognition.

We are striving to expand contacts with everyone, with all West European states. We hope that the processes now taking place in the USSR and other socialist countries will make it possible to arrive at such forms of management and such financial and currency instruments as will create the conditions for broad cooperation and rapprochement of states. Naturally, this is not unilateral movement. To a large extent, our Western partners, too, should take a fresh look at the present situation and work out the approach. In general, losing no time, it is necessary to accumulate experience in cooperation, including by means of forming joint enterprises and other forms of mutually useful exchange.

Issues of Soviet-Irish economic cooperation were discussed in this spirit. Giving a positive appraisal of what has been done in this of late, the leaders of the two states agreed on the staging of specific talks on the development of bilateral economic ties.

The conversation took place in an atmosphere of mutual understanding and friendliness. Taking part from the Soviet side were Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister; Yakovlev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; and Uranov, USSR ambassador to Ireland. Taking part from the Irish side were Lenihan, deputy prime minister and foreign minister; other members of the Irish leadership; and Whelan, Irish ambassador to the USSR.

Haughey Evaluates Talks

LD0304092689 Moscow TASS in English 0903 GMT 3 Apr 89

[Text] Dublin Apr 3 TASS—By TASS Correspondent Sergey Oleynik:

The Irish Prime Minister Charles Haughey qualified the talks he had at Shannon with Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, as "exceptionally successful". In his interview to national newspapers and television he spoke highly of their discussion of bilateral relations, particularly economic cooperation. Haughey noted that perestroyka had opened up much broader vistas for trade between the two countries. He said that the talks had touched on concrete areas where Soviet-Irish cooperation could be further developed—fishing, shipbuilding and repair, air service, barter deliveries of Irish food products to the USSR. A delegation of Irish ministers will shortly go to Moscow to discuss these matters in greater detail.

Haughey said that the sides had also discussed the problem of Northern Ireland. He stressed that the Soviet leader had called attention more than once to the human aspect of this problem, saying that it was a tragedy which should be resolved.

The prime minister of Ireland said that the Soviet leader was a very interesting and prepossessing personality. He is open and prepared to discuss any problem frankly. I would like to visit the USSR and to meet the Soviet leader again, he said.

French Defense Minister Arrives, Met by Yazov

LD0304085589 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0824 GMT 3 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow, 3 Apr (TASS)—French Defense Minister Jean-Pierre Chevenement arrived in Moscow today for an official visit at the invitation of Army General Dmitriy Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister.

He was met at the airport by Dmitriy Yazov and other officials. Yves Pagniez, French ambassador to the USSR, was among the welcoming party.

Jean-Pierre Chevenement will spend 3 days in Moscow, during which there will be meetings with the USSR defense minister. The program for the visit includes visits to a number of military units. On 6 April Jean-Pierre Chevenement will fly to Murmansk (the north European part of Russia), and then to Volgograd (on the Volga). On 7 April the French defense minister will return home.

Yazov, Chevenement Hold Talks

LD0304150989 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1455 GMT 3 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow, 3 Apr (TASS)—A meeting took place today between Army General Dmitriy Yazov, candidate member of the politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR minister of defense, and Jean-Pierre Chevenement, France's minister of defense. They discussed questions of mutual interest.

Jean-Pierre Chevenement arrived in Moscow today on an official visit at the invitation of the USSR Ministry of Defense.

Yazov Interviewed on Visit

LD0304130589 Moscow TASS in English 1241 GMT 3 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow April 3 TASS—"We hope that talks with French defence minister, Mr. Jean-Pierre Chevenement, will be successful and constructive", general of the Army Dmitriy Yazov, Soviet minister of defence, said in connection with the French defence minister's just-started official visit to the Soviet Union.

"During meetings", Yazov said in an interview with TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy, "we shall endeavour to discuss the state of affairs that has taken shape in Europe in view of a considerable unilateral reduction of conventional arms by the Soviet Union. And still, it would be prematurely to hope that already today we shall be able to resolve all problems facing us".

"During his stay Mr. Jean-Pierre Chevenement will familiarise himself with the life and duty of Soviet Army servicemen, will visit Murmansk, the northern fleet, and the hero city of Volgograd. This will enable the French defence minister to get a more accurate and objective idea of the Soviet Armed Forces and of the perestroika processes which have affected them," General of the Army Dmitriy Yazov said in conclusion.

UK Call for Najibullah Resignation Criticized

PM0204174189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Apr 89 Second Edition p 4

[Report by unidentified TASS diplomatic correspondent: "At the USSR Foreign Ministry"]

[Text] Western news agencies report that British Foreign Secretary Geoffrey Howe, speaking at a press conference in Delhi, called upon President Najibullah of the Republic of Afghanistan to "resign voluntarily" in order to, as he put it, "make it possible to set up a broad-based government". He also claimed that most of the international public would like to see Najibullah resign.

The TASS diplomatic correspondent contacted a representative of the USSR Foreign Ministry for comment. He said the following:

Both we and the international public are well aware of Geoffrey Howe's view regarding an Afghan settlement. For our part, we have frequently commented on it and demonstrated that this view is far removed from political realism. This latest statement by Geoffrey Howe, which is an instance of crude interference in the affairs of a sovereign country at a most crucial period in its existence, smacks strongly of imperial ambition. One is tempted to ask who has given Geoffrey Howe the right to speak on behalf of "most of the international public." Indulging in wishful thinking is a sure way of driving any international issue into a deadend.

Immediate measures must now be taken to put an end to the bloodshed, and the path toward this has been determined. The international community gave unreserved support to the Geneva Afghanistan accords and the resolution adopted by the 43d session of the UN General Assembly in favor of setting up an inter-Afghan dialogue. That resolution, we would recall, was adopted by consensus, i.e. with everyone's agreement, including that of Great Britain.

The Government of the Republic of Afghanistan and President Najibullah are most decisively and consistently in favor of dialogue. And who is against it? The irreconcilable opposition, which, with the help of its sponsors, is attempting to flout the Geneva accords.

One can only regret that Geoffrey Howe has effectively found himself on the side of those who are working toward bloody carnage on Afghan territory.

Recently speaking about the Afghan settlement, Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher said literally the following: "I think that the withdrawal of the Soviet troops does indeed point to a new realism." The time has come for the British side to show its realism.

The world public has a right to expect from Great Britain, which is also a permanent member of the UN Security Council, a responsible approach that would promote the speediest possible settling of the conflict by the Afghans themselves without interference and instigation from outside.

British Press Welcomes Coming Gorbachev Visit

LD0304082989 Moscow TASS in English 0745 GMT 3 Apr 89

[Text] London April 3 TASS—The British press welcomes Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev's upcoming visit to the country. The visit is to begin later this week.

THE DAILY MIRROR emphasizes that "Mr Gorbachev and his wife will be warmly welcomed by the whole of the British people".

In an article headlined "A Man for Europe" the newspaper refers to as "historic" the Soviet leader's statement made at Shannon and calls for the development of all-round cooperation between the Soviet Union and Britain.

Commenting on Mikhail Gorbachev's speech at Shannon, THE GUARDIAN points out that the Soviet leader's efforts are focused "on building a politically healthier and looser order in Europe, involving conventional force cuts as well as closer economic relations between the EEC and Eastern Europe".

The newspaper points out that "the message from both sides is mutual recognition of the need to solve international problems by negotiation rather than by confrontation", even despite disagreements over a number of issues.

The influential FINANCIAL TIMES newspaper emphasizes that the two countries' positions on regional issues have much in common: "They have a common interest in promoting a new regional peace agreement in southern Africa, and continuing the peacemaking progress in the Middle East, Cambodia, and Central America".

Latin America & Caribbean

Gorbachev Visits Cuba, Meets Castro

Ligachev, Yazov See Off Gorbachev

LD0204074289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0629 GMT 2 Apr 89

[Text] [no dateline as received] On 2 April, M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, left Moscow for Havana on an official friendly visit at the invitation of Fidel Castro Ruz, first secretary of the Communist Party of Cuba [PCS] Central Committee and chairman of the Council of State and Ministers of the Republic of Cuba. Later he will make an official visit to Britain at the invitation of that country's leadership. On the way to Cuba, M.S. Gorbachev will make a brief stopover at Ireland's Shannon Airport, where a Soviet-Irish summit meeting will take place.

On his trip, M.S. Gorbachev is accompanied by E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USR minister of foreign affairs; A.N. Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; and V.M. Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

At the airport, M.S. Gorbachev was seen off by CPSU Central Committee Politburo members L.N. Zaykov, Ye.K. Ligachev, V.A. Medvedev, N.I. Ryzhkov, N.N. Slyunkov, and V.M. Chebrikov; by candidate members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo A.P. Biryukova, A.V. Vlasov, A.I. Lukyanov, Yu.D. Maslyukov, G.P. Razumovskiy, N.V. Talyzin, and D.T. Yazov, CPSU Central Committee Secretary O.D. Baklanov, and other comrades.

Among those seeing him off were R. Braithwaite, Britain's ambassador to the USSR; R. Mirabal, Cuba's charge d'affaires in the USSR; and D. MacFhionnibhairr, Ireland's charge d'affaires in the USSR.

Gorbachev Arrives in Havana

PM0304154389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Apr 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Report by unnamed TASS special correspondent: "M. Gorbachev in Cuba"]

[Text] 3 Apr—M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, who is paying an official visit to the Republic of Cuba at the invitation of Fidel Castro, first secretary of the Communist Party of Cuba [PCC] Central Committee and president of the Cuban State Council and Council of Ministers, arrived in Havana 2 April.

The Soviet and Cuban state flags were flying at Jose Marti Airport, where the Soviet Il-62 airliner landed and a Revolutionary Armed Forces honor guard was drawn up on the tarmac.

On descending from the aircraft the Soviet leader and his wife were greeted by F. Castro; Army General Raul Castro, second secretary of the PCC Central Committee, deputy chairman of the Cuban State Council and Council of Ministers, and minister of the Revolutionary Armed Forces; and Vilma Espin, chair of the Federation of Cuban Women.

M.S. Gorbachev is accompanied on his trip by E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister; A.N. Yakovlev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and V.M. Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

Carlos Rafael Rodriguez, member of the PCC Central Committee Politburo and deputy chairman of the Cuban State Council and Council of Ministers; Julio Camacho Aguilera, member of the PCC Central Committee Politburo and Cuban ambassador to the USSR, members of the Cuban party and state leadership, and other officials were there to greet him.

USSR Ambassador to Cuba Yu. V. Petrov was also there.

The Cuban and Soviet anthems were played and there was a 21-gun salute.

M.S. Gorbachev received the honor guard commander's report. The Soviet leader and F. Castro inspected the Cuban troops.

Mikhail Sergeyevich was introduced to the members of the Cuban party and government leadership, leaders of public organizations, heads of diplomatic missions in Havana, and employees of the USSR embassy and other Soviet overseas institutions in Cuba.

Pioneers presented flowers to M.S. Gorbachev and F. Castro. The USSR and Cuban leaders were welcomed by working people who had gathered at the airport to greet the Soviet delegation.

The welcoming ceremony ended with a march-past by the honor guard.

The Soviet and Cuban leaders got into an open car and, accompanied by a motorcycle escort, set off for the picturesque Havana district of Cubanacan, where M.S. Gorbachev is staying.

Hundreds of thousands of people turned out in the capital to ardently greet the Soviet visitor and F. Castro all along the 30-kilometer route. Many were holding placards: "Long Live Cuban-Soviet friendship!" "Welcome, Comrade Gorbachev!" That was the way Cubans greeted the leader of the CPSU and Soviet state.

[Moscow TASS in English at 0215 GMT on 3 April carries a similar report which adds: "Havana newspapers write that the Cubans have been looking forward to this visit which must give fresh impetus to developing fraternal relations between the two countries. Soviet-Cuban friendship originated in the difficult years of Cuban revolutin when U.S. imperialism encircled the republic in economic blockade and threatened with direct armed aggression. The Soviet Union helped the Cubans to hold out against the enemies of the revolution, to overcome the traditional economic backwardness, to create their own material-technical base for development and to start building socialism.

["No less difficult and responsible tasks are facing the USSR and Cuba nowadays. The positive changes in the international arena and internal processes in the two countries open up new prospects for Soviet-Cuban cooperation. Therefore high importance is attached to the Soviet leader's visit. The issues of war and peace, ecological security, bilateral cooperation and economic development—these and many other problems will be in the focus of detailed discussion at the Soviet-Cuban talks."]

Cubans Welcome Gorbachev

PM0304154989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Apr 89 First Edition p4

[Report by PRAVDA special correspondents G. Zafesov and A. Moiseyev under the rubric "Our Special Correspondents Report From the Cuban Capital": "Passing on the Fighting Tradition"]

[Excerpts] Havana, 3 Apr—Havana is looking different lately. Soviet and Cuban flags are waving in the wind on the streets and the capital of the island of freedom is always lively. But you do not often see as many people as we saw on the day M.S. Gorbachev, head of the Soviet state, flew into Cuba. Several hours before the aircraft of the high-ranking Soviet guest arrived, it was impossible to make your way through the streets of Havana and the highway leading to "Jose Marti" international airport—either by transport or on foot. Neither the burning sun nor the furious tropical downpour, which suddenly burst over people's heads from clouds that seemed to appear from nowhere, stopped the people of Havana. But the elemental forces of nature proved powerless before the ardent hearts of the Cuban people, whose representatives—the people of Havana and its suburbs—came out to greet M.S. Gorbachev and those accompanying him. [Passage omitted]

The motorcade passed through the suburbs and the streets. The noisy cries of welcome died away. But, until late into the night, you could see groups of people in the city, exchanging their impressions on their first meeting with the Soviet leader. We can say without any exaggeration: Our Cuban friends have taken a liking to M.S. Gorbachev. They opened their warm hearts to him in greeting. And it is not just a question of natural human liking, of course: Its roots lie in the history of our countries and our peoples, their joint achievements, and common plans yet to be fulfilled. Tomorrow will see new meetings, new work, the discussion of sometimes difficult problems and issues, and the search for solutions. These solutions will be found. The inviolable friendship which exists between the Soviet and Cuban peoples will guarantee this.

Gorbachev Notes 'Genuine Enthusiasm'

LD0304093289 Moscow TASS in English 0930 GMT 3 Apr 89

[Text] Havana April 3 TASS—By TASS special correspondent:

Soviet Leader Mikhail Gorbachev arrived in Havana on April 2 for an official friendly visit to the Republic of Cuba at the invitation of Cuban leader Fidel Castro.

Hundreds of thousands of residents of the capital ardently cheered the Soviet guest and Fidel Castro throughout the 30-kilometre route covered by the motorcade on the way to the residence assigned to Mikhail Gorbachev in Havana's picturesque district of Cubanacan.

Upon arrival at the residence Mikhail Gorbachev and Fidel Castro had their first talk with journalists who cover the visit. Gorbachev described his first impressions as tremendous. He said he came to feel the genuine enthusiasm of the Cuban people and their openness and pointed out that Havana is a beautiful city.

The Soviet leader emphasized that the Soviet Union and all Soviet people valued friendship with Cuba very much, strong and sincere friendship that had stood the test throughout the years and times, including difficult ones.

In answer to a journalist's question, Gorbachev said that Latin America was reaching a wide road of historical development and pointed to democratic processes unfolding in the region.

Fidel Castro said that Mikhail Gorbachev's visit generated an immense interest. No other meeting drew so many journalists or was watched on television by such large audiences as this one, he emphasized.

Havana newspapers write that Cubans has been looking for a visit which is to give a new impetus to the development of fraternal friendship between the two countries.

Friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union and Cuba originated in the years which were difficult for the Cuban revolution when U.S. imperialism mounted an economic blockade of Cuba and was threatening it with a direct armed aggression. The Soviet Union helped the Cubans to hold out in the struggle against the enemies of the revolution, to overcome economic dependence and to create their own material and technical basis for development and to begin to build socialism.

The present stage sets no less complex and responsible tasks to the Soviet Union and Cuba. Positive changes taking place in the international arena and internal processes in the two countries open up new prospects for Soviet-Cuban cooperation.

This is why very much attention is being attached to the Soviet leader's visit. Peace and disarmament, ecological security, bilateral cooperation and economic development—these and many other issues will become the subject of detailed discussion during Soviet-Cuban talks.

Gorbachev, Castro Meet Press

LD0304080589 Moscow World Service in English 0700 GMT 3 Apr 89

[Excerpts] The Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev has arrived on an official visit of friendship in Cuba. [passage omitted]

At an impromptu news conference near the residence, Mikhail Gorbachev warmly thanked the Cubans for their hospitality, saying he felt the embrace of friends. The Soviet leader said he hoped the outcome of his visit to Cuba would be important for the whole of Latin America. He remarked that in recent years he had many meetings with representatives of the continent's countries and had been impressed by Latin America's progress in every field.

The program of the visit includes talks of Mikhail Gorbachev and Fidel Castro, the signing of a treaty of friendship and cooperation between the two countries, and the Soviet leader's speech at the National Assembly. [passage omitted]

Further on News Conference

PM0304152489 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Apr 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "M.S. Gorbachev and F. Castro Talk With Journalists"]

[Text] M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, who has arrived in the Republic of Cuba on an official visit, and the Cuban leader F. Castro have had their first talk with journalists covering the visit in Havana.

M.S. Gorbachev, answering questions on his first impressions, said: Striking impressions! I have met with the people of Cuba before. Our friendship is in our hearts, in our souls, on our faces. Now all we have to do is talk, and we have plenty to talk about....

Question: Have you already talked about some things?

M.S. Gorbachev: Thus far, basically, we exchanged impressions, on the way here. I felt the people's unfeigned enthusiasm, their openness. And, you know, another thing that pleased me—they are healthy people. That is good. And even at a hasty glance you notice that Havana is a beautiful city. I wish to convey to the Cubans my enormous sense of gratitude for the reception, the openness of people's hearts, the enthusiasm, the sympathy. We have fallen into the arms of friends. That is wonderful!

Question: About 600 journalists from all over the world have come here to cover M.S. Gorbachev's visit. What can the world gain from this visit, which is being carefully followed by the leading mass media?

F. Castro: It seems to me that never before, at no meeting in our country, have there been so many journalists, no other meeting has been watched on television by so many people. Comrade Gorbachev's visit has aroused enourmous interest.

The talk then returned to the subject of our peoples' friendship.

M.S. Gorbachev: I am overwhelmed by this reception. A real torrent of feelings. I do not suppose I am saying anything new, but our country, all our people greatly value friendship with Cuba, a friendship that is strong, sincere, has lived through the years, through different times, some of them difficult, a friendship that is tried and tested—this is entirely clear, and that is a good thing, it is the most important thing.

F. Castro: And even the weather has behaved well—the sun was not shining before, it was raining a little, it was cool.

M.S. Gorbachev: I see you have splendid natural conditions.

Question: What is the temperature in Moscow now?

M.S. Gorbachev: In Moscow we sat in the plane for 45 minutes unable to take off—there was a snowstorm.

Question: What can you say about the significance of this visit for the Latin American countries, where there is enormous interest in it?

M.S. Gorbachev: In recent years I have had many meetings with representatives of the Latin American continent. There were very important talks. It seems to me that this continent is emerging onto the high road of historical development. You see what processes are developing. Soon here too, I am confident, the processes of democracy will be stepped up, will gather force; they are already emerging. The giants of the future are taking shape here. I think this continent has a great future.

In conclusion M.S. Gorbachev expressed satisfaction that the visit to Cuba, planned to take place earlier, is now happening. It was prevented from happening last December by the earthquake in Armenia. He spoke about the work that is under way to eliminate the consequences of this natural disaster.

Gorbachev Praises Welcome

LD0304063689 Moscow TASS in English 0628 GMT 3 Apr 89

[Text] Havana April 3 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev and Fidel Castro have held their first meeting with the press in a residence assigned to the Soviet leader who arrived here for an official friendly visit on Sunday.

Gorbachev described his first impressions as "striking" praising the honest enthusiasm and openness of the Cuban people. He added that that Havana is a magnificent city.

The Soviet leader thanked the Cubans for the welcome, enthusiasm and sympathy.

Gorbachev emphasised that the Soviet Union, all Soviet people cherish their friendship with Cuba. This friendship is strong, sincere and time-tested, it has continued for years, passing sometimes through very complicated periods.

Asked about the significance of his visit for Latin American countries which show great interest in his trip, the Soviet leader said that he had had many meetings with Latin American representatives over the past few years. He expressed the view that this continent is embarking on a wide road of historical development and pointed to unfolding processes of democracy in this region.

"I think that this continent has a great future," he added.

The Cuban leader pointed out that Gorbachev's visit has evoked immense interest. "No other meeting has ever attracted so many journalists, no other meeting has ever been watched on television by so many people," he emphasised.

Gorbachev Grants Interview

LD0304051489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0400 GMT 3 Apr 89

[Text] Upon arriving from Jose Marti Airport at the residence given to him, the Soviet leader gave an interview to Soviet and foreign journalists. Here is the recording:

[Begin Gorbachev recording] Our friendship is in our hearts, in the soul. [voices heard in the background] I want to tell the people of Cuba, to express my enormous feelings of gratitude for this meeting, for the openness of their hearts, for their enthusiasm. It is so important for our people—and I am now also saying this for Soviet television and radio—that we have found ourselves in the embrace of friends. This is splendid. I have been touched in an amicable way. I will probably not be saying anything new when I say that both our country and all of our people value very much your friendship so robust, sincere.

I know that in recent years I have had a great many meetings with representatives of the Latin American continent. We have had very important conversations. It seems to me that this continent is coming out onto a wide road of historical development. Give it a while longer and the processes of democracy will gather strength here. They are already getting under way. A gigantic future is forming here. I think there is a great future for this continent. [end recording]

Gorbachev Tours Revolution Square

LD0304144189 Moscow TASS in English 1429 GMT 3 Apr 89

[Text] Havana April 3 TASS—Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev began the second day of his visit to Cuba with a tour of Revolution Square featuring a 140-metre grey-stone monument crowned with a sculpture of Jose Marti.

Gorbachev laid a wreath at the foot of the memorial to the legendary Cuban patriot known in the republic as an apostle of freedom.

The ceremony was attended by Cuban leader Fidel Castro.

Hundreds of people who gathered in Revolution Square to watch the ceremony warmly greeted the Soviet leader.

Cuba Assembly Session Set for 4 Apr

LD0104133389 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 1 Apr 89

[Text] In connection with the official, friendly visit by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, which begins on Sunday [2 April], the Council of State of the Republic of Cuba has announced the decision to convoke an extraordinary, ceremonial session of the National Assembly of the People's Government. It will take place on 4 April.

Reportage on Visit, Soviet-Cuban Relations

Soviet-Cuban Ties Examined

LD3103045789 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 30 Mar 89

[Commentary by Moscow Radio Havana correspondent Viktor Dmitriyev]

[Text] Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev will pay a visit to Cuba from the 2d to the 5th of April. In this connection, we put several questions to Moscow Radio's correspondent in Havana, Viktor Dmitriyev.

The two countries have been cooperating in many fields, in the first place of the economy. What are the details of this cooperation?

[Dmitriyev in Russian with superimposed English translation] Cuba has with Soviet assistance built anew or modernized about 400 industrial plants and other facilities, many of them in the basic industries. Bilateral trade has grown dozens of times. This year it is expected to reach 9 billion rubles. The Soviet Union accounts for 70 percent of Cuba's foreign trade.

One may sometimes hear that Cuba has no basic industry where it has no assistance from the Soviet Union, and that is true. A great deal has been done. But it is also true that the effectiveness of our cooperation could have been greater.

What are the main problems in economic relations between the two countries? Well, here are some factors. The structure of Soviet export in some cases is far from optimum. Delayed construction projects and the slow introduction of newly built industrial facilities. These drawbacks have been much in evidence as the Soviet Union has been carrying out perestroyka and Cuba has been correcting errors and eliminating unfavorable trends. Recent months highlighted this problem. Soviet industrial plants which have received independence have found it more profitable to sell their products to capitalist countries and socialist countries in Europe rather than to Cuba. That had a negative effect on Soviet supplies. However, Soviet foreign trade agencies have reacted in time and it is already clear what has to be done to improve the situation.

[Announcer] There's been speculation in the West about some difficulties in Soviet-Cuban relations. Viktor Dmitriyev said the mass media in the United States have been trying to produce the impression that the Soviet Union and Cuba now have poorer understanding of each other. In this they have been juggling with the difference between Soviet perestroyka and Cuba's efforts to correct mistakes and unfavorable trends. In other words, our differences are confined to the fact that the Cuban leadership in its activity has failed to copy measures taken by the Soviet Union.

Meanwhile, a mere several years ago the very same analysts accused Cuba of following in the Soviet Union's footsteps. The president of the History of Cuba Institute, (Jorge Enrique Mendoza) said this: [(Mendoza) in Spanish with superimposed English report] He said imperialism will always act that way. This time it has used renewal in the Soviet Union and the correction of mistakes in Cuba. In about 10 years it will find something else to criticize in both countries. True, our way of development is different, but they don't have to be similiar. The Soviet Union has launced a set of measures that the Soviet leadership has found expedient. We have our own process which meets local conditions. Besides, in discussing any differences we have always easily found fraternal understanding.

In conclusion (Jorge Enrique Mendoza) says that the Cuban people are looking with enthusiasm to Mikhail Gorbachev's visit, which is expected to bring about still stronger relations between our two countries, between our peoples and parties.

Foreign Ministry Official on Visit

AU3103170989 Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO in Bulgarian 30 Mar 89 p 4

[Interview with Yuriy Pavlov, chief of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Latin American Countries' Department, by NOVOSTI observer Yuriy Gvozdev: "From the Positions of New Political Thinking"—"special for RABOTNICHESKO DELO"; date and place of interview not given; first paragraph is an introduction]

[Text] [Gvozdev] Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Cuba begins on 2 April. It will take place under qualitatively new conditions, because, for the first time in many years the tension in East-West relations has been alleviated, the dialogue between the USSR and the United States is successfully developing, and mutual understanding between these two countries is improving. How do such changes, in your opinion, reflect upon the situation in the Caribbean? Do they not weaken the relations of traditional, fraternal, friendship between the Soviet Union and Cuba?

[Pavlov] Today, when confrontation on the international scene is being replaced by cooperation and by the search for mutually acceptable solutions to controversial problems, the situation in the Caribbean is also changing. Naturally, it is still far from being normal. The United States is still maintaining the economic blockade against Cuba, and just as in the past, American businessmen are still deprived of the possibility to establish mutually advantageous relations with Cubans. People in Washington, however, are increasingly aware of how hopeless the policy of gross pressure against the freedom-loving Cuban people has become. The absurdity of such a policy, conducted from the position of strength, became particularly evident after Cuba had restored its relations with the majority of Latin American countries which, following the victory of revolution, had obeyed the diktat of the United States. Cuba is now taking its worthy place in the community of Latin American countries. I am convinced that the normalization of Cuban-American relations is only a matter of time.

As to the relations of fraternal friendship and solidarity existing between Cuba and the Soviet Union, based on a common social system, the positive changes in the international situation are creating even more favorable conditions for their further development and consolidation. Mikhail Gorbachev's forthcoming visit to Cuba is a convincing confirmation of this fact.

[Gvozdev] There is no doubt that the new political thinking conforms with the vital interests of peoples in countries such as Cuba, which are defending their legitimate rights of freedom of choice and of national independence.

[Pavlov] The myth about the "Soviet threat" and about the alleged "expansionism" of the USSR is falling apart before our eyes. Along with this myth, the legend about Cuba allegedly being a base of Soviet influence and a tool of Soviet penetration in the Western hemisphere, and even in Africa, is also being totally unmasked. You recall, how many papers and reports were written on this subject by the respective U.S. departments and how many critical speeches were delivered in Washington on the same issue. All these efforts were aimed at discrediting Cuba in the eyes of the American public and isolating the country from the rest of Latin America in order to punish it for its "stubbornness."

The Cuban people are fully entitled to be proud of their economic, cultural, and social development, of having established an advanced health care and educational system in their country. The experience of socialist Cuba in resolving the existing problems in these spheres is very interesting for numerous countries, especially for those in Latin America. I had the opportunity to attend Fidel Castro's meetings with journalists in Caracas, where he convincingly described the achievements of socialism in Cuba and I listened to him with great attention. We could all learn from Cuba's example and this applies also to the Americans. Variety makes the world rich.

On the other hand, we should unmistakably point out the following fact: Neither the Soviet Union, nor Cuba are engaged in exporting socialism. Revolution is not an export commodity. I have no doubt that the Americans are well acquainted with the categorical statements of both Soviet and Cuban leaders on this subject. We are against the export of revolution and of counterrevolution as well.

[Gvozdev] I think that Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Cuba may also contribute to the process of settling regional conflicts in Central America. What is your prediction in this respect?

[Pavlov] Promising factors have recently emerged in the development of the situation in Central America. The Soviet Union and Cuba are both in favor of a political settlement of the Central American conflict, provided that the interests of all countries situated in the area should be guaranteed and they should be granted the right of independent development. This constructive stand is appreciated in Latin America and plays a role of essential importance in connection with settling the existing conflict. Nevertheless, the main factors likely to guarantee peace in Central America are the joint political will of all countries in the area and their common striving to settle all problems by peaceful means.

[Gvozdev] The importance of Mikhail Gorbachev's visit will by no means be limited to the further consolidation of Soviet-Cuban friendship. This visit will certainly be very important for Latin America as a whole.

[Pavlov] Of course, this visit will attract the attention of the sub-continent as a whole, and not only because it is the first visit of a Soviet head of state to Latin America, but above all, because of the influence of USSR policy upon the whole system of international relations. This is a policy based on truly humanitarian principles. The efforts of the Soviet Union are directed at the solution of all global and regional problems which affect the interests of the developing countries in the Western hemisphere—such as disarmament, the foreign debt, and the Central American conflict.

The Soviet Union highly appreciates the constructive contribution of the Latin American states to the consolidation of positive trends in the development of the international situation.

Another fact is evident—the United States has no reason whatsoever to suspect the USSR of trying to take advantage of its developing relations with the Latin American countries in order to undermine their traditional relations with the United States, or with other Western countries.

Visit Demonstrates 'New Thinking'

LD0104021689 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 31 Mar 89

[Vladislav Kozyakov commentary]

[Text] Mikhail Gorbachev's arrival in Cuba next Sunday [2 April] will mark his first ever trip to Latin America. Vladislav Kozyakov comments:

The forthcoming event is stirring particular interest in the context of the new political thinking proclaimed by the Soviet leadership. Observers in Washington have been saying the Soviet Union now has an opportunity to demonstrate its new thinking in Latin America. Meanwhile, the new approach to international affairs is already working. Moscow and Havana have voiced their support for the peace plan adopted by the five Central American presidents. They have also made their contribution to the settlement in southern Africa, and Cuban soldiers have been returning home from Angola. In addition, the Soviet Union has stopped all weapon supplies to the armed groups in El Salvador, Guatemala, and elsewhere.

Mikhail Gorbachev has dismissed as absurd the allegations about this country's intention to initiate a series of socialist revolutions in Latin America. In his book "Restructuring: A New Thinking for Our Country and the World," he points out that we do sympathize with the Latin American people's struggle for independence, but we don't have any selfish interests in the region. We don't need either raw materials or labor force there and we don't need to take advantage of the local people's anti-American sentiments. We do not intend to break the historical relations between Latin America and the United States. This, Mikhail Gorbachev says, would be adventurism rather than policy making; and we are realists, not adventurists.

Of course, new political thinking is not a one-way street. [words indistinct] achievements, including the INF Treaty, the Geneva Accords on Afghanistan and the agreement on southern Africa are a result of combined efforts. And these are essential to the Western Hemisphere. The recent (?statements) by U.S. officials in favor of a regional dialogue so that the guns of war can stand silent throughout Central America have sounded very promising. Now there's the need to make sure that work in that direction is put into practice.

Agenda of Visit Outlined

LD0104101889 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0515 GMT 1 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow, 1 Apr (TASS)—TASS diplomatic correspondent writes: From the 2 April to 5 April Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium will for the first time pay an official friendly visit to the Republic of Cuba.

As is well known, Mikhail Gorbachev's visit was planned for December last year but was postponed in connection with the earthquake in Armenia.

The program of the visit includes meetings between the Soviet leader with Fidel Castro, the first secretary of the Cuban Communist Party, president of the Council of State, and chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers; Soviet-Cuban talks between members of the delegations; and a speech by Mikhail Gorbachev to the Cuban National Assembly of People's Power. Also planned are the laying of wreaths at the monuments to V.I. Lenin and Jose Marti, a visit to the "Expocuba" exhibition, to a family clinic, and to the scientific research center for biotechnology.

A separate program has been prepared for Raisa Gorbachev. The wife of the Soviet leader will visit the "La Cabana" fortress and the National Museum of Fine Arts, the Hemingway Museum, and the National Aquarium and will meet members of the board of the national association of Cuban-Soviet Friendship.

In Soviet diplomatic circles confidence is being expressed that the Soviet-Cuban summit meeting will be an important stage in the further strengthening of friendly ties between the peoples of our countries and a new step in the development of mutually advantageous cooperation in different spheres.

Cuban Vice Premier Previews Visit

LD0104032189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1628 GMT 31 Mar 89

[Excerpts] Havana, 31 Mar (TASS)—The open, democratic, and humane character of the policy being pursued by the Soviet Union in the international arena was stressed by Carlos Rafael Rodriguez, member of the Politburo of the Cuban Communist Party Central Committee and deputy chairman of the State Council and the Council of Ministers of the republic. On the eve of the official visit to that country by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Rodriguez met with Soviet journalists accredited here.

The representative of the Cuban leadership declared that the people of Cuba with great enthusiasm will welcome Comrade Gorbachev, who by his visit demonstrates solidarity with the Cuban people, support for the Cuban revolution, respect for the leadership of our country and personally for Fidel Castro, and is thereby confirming the indissoluble ties and unity between our peoples. With his own eyes the Soviet leader will be convinced of the sincere affection which the Cuban people feel for him, something explained first and foremost by high esteem for the Soviet leader's personal qualities, and for the great deal of work he had done in recent years in the interests of bringing about positive changes in the world, eliminating confrontation, and expanding mutual understanding between peoples. These sentiments will be expressed not just to the Soviet leader, but also to the Soviet people and the CPSU, whose history has been closely linked with the history of our country over the last 30 years. [passage omitted]

Speaking about his country's participation in the processes of multilateral integration developing in the world, C.R. Rodriguez pointed out that there is no contradiction between Cuba's relations with the USSR and the socialist countries, and ties with the countries of Latin America. These are two elements of one and the same process. [passage omitted]

The level of Soviet-Cuban cooperation in the economic sphere received high approbation. From a backward agrarian country, Cuba has turned into a nation with a fairly modern agriculture and a developing industrial sector. Relying on cooperation with the USSR, we are continuing to develop industry.

We are attentively following the processes of restructuring in the USSR, said C. Rafael Rodriguez. We hope that these efforts will be crowned with success.

In conclusion, firm conviction was expressed that M.S. Gorbachev's forthcoming visit to Cuba would once again confirm the invariable nature of relations of indestructible friendship and cooperation between the USSR and Cuba.

Cuban Vice Premier Views Ties

PM0304090789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Apr 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Special correspondents B. Vasiliyev, A. Kamorin dispatch under the rubric "Panorama of International Events:" "Cuba—Integral Part of Community"]

[Excerpt] Havana—On Thursday [30 March] Carlos Rafael Rodriguez, member of the Communist Party of Cuba Central Committee Politburo and vice president of the Republic of Cuba State Council, received Soviet journalists.

C.R. Rodgriguez emphasized that the choice of Cuba for the first visit to a Latin American country by the Soviet leader is an expression of the profound sympathies which exist between our peoples and of the indestructible historical ties between the two countries. The planned signing of a Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation, he said, is a direct continuation of the fruitful cooperation between our two states over the past 30 years. No special significance should be attached to the fact that such a treaty does not yet exist between Cuba and the USSR. Soviet-Cuban relations have now reached a level which makes the conclusion of the treaty extremely timely and extremely important for the further development of this process, the Cuban leader noted.

Dwelling on ways of enhancing the effectiveness of bilateral economic cooperation, C.F. Rodriguez said in part:

"Our economic ties span almost 3 decades. During this time Cuba has been completely transformed. Our country's position contrasts with the situation in other Latin American countries, which are experiencing an acute economic crisis. In contrast to them, production is growing steadily in Cuba. Considerable credit for this belongs to Soviet-Cuban cooperation. Today it is impossible to find a corner of the island or a sector of our economy where the ties between our countries have not left their mark."

The vice president of the State Council answered Soviet journalists' questions in detail Asked by IZVESTIYA correspondents to comment on the view expressed by certain Latin American press organs that if Cuba wants to be become more involved in regional processes, it will have to become "less socialist and more Latin American," C.R. Rodriguez replied that he sees no contradiction in Cuba's status as a socialist and a Latin American country. "We maintain very close political and economic ties with the socialist world, but geographically and historically we are part of this continent.

"Cuba is an integral part of the [socialist] community. The socialist countries are implementing an integration program, and, as far as our conditions allow, we seek to participate in all the measures of this program. However, this does not mean that we are 'cutting ourselves off' from Latin America. Within the framework of the community's new strategy, which is increasingly open to contacts with all the world's countries, our orientation toward Latin America is entirely natural. There are no contradictions in the practical sphere either. For instance, Cuba cooperates with CEMA, and above all the USSR, in the sphere of machine building, and at the same time it is collaborating fruitfully with Mexican firms in this sphere.

"Integration processes are under way in the region. They are developing with difficulty and are not always as successful as we might wish," C.R. Rodriguez said further. "However, the will of the continent's states to pool their efforts is being expressed more and more resolutely. Cuba could become the 'connecting link' between the two integration processes—the socialist and the Latin American process. We are prepared to play the most active role in this respect."

Our second question related to the interview with C.R. Rodriguez published in the Japanese newspaper YOMIURI, in which he reportedly referred to existing "differences" between the USSR and Cuba in the sphere of economic relations.

"This calls for an explanation," he said. "Nothing like this was said. I find it difficult to explain how these words could have appeared in YOMIURI, because the whole relatively long conversation with the correspondent, Mr Nakasone, was taped. I would like to cite here that part of the interview which refers to Soviet-Cuban relations."

C.R. Rodriguez aquainted those present with his replies to the Japanese journalist, using a stenographic record:

Question: The Western press is writing about opposition in Cuba to the changes in the Soviet Union. Is this an erroneous opinion?

Answer: I believe it is. I assume that two things are being confused here—the application of "restructuring" in our country is one matter, while the Soviet restructuring as such is a totally different matter. Fidel Castro has stressed that we cannot simply ape what is happening in the Soviet Union. Our conditions are different. They are different from the historical viewpoint, the geographical viewpoint, and the viewpoint of the structure and level of development of our economy. It would be wrong not to take this into account.... We apply anything that we consider useful in our society. Just as the Soviet Union, we apply a combination of moral and material labor incentives, but we attach greater importance to moral incentives and the working people's consciousness.

Question: So it is not to be expected that Cuba will apply a Soviet restructuring, even in the economic sphere, in the near future?

Answer: I see no possibility of applying methods like those used in the USSR in the next few years. Naturally, there is much that we have in common. It is not a matter of contradictions between ourselves and the Soviet Union. It is merely an issue of doing many things differently from the Soviet Union....

Fidel Castro has reportedly said to Gorbachev in the course of a friendly conversation: "Cubans are being criticized for not doing what the Soviet Union is doing." And Gorbachev replied: "Why should we be the same?"

"As you can see," C.R. Rodriguez concluded his remarks to Soviet journalists, "I did not discuss 'contradictions' between Cuba and the Soviet Union with the Japanese journalist."

At the end of the meeting the full text of C.R. Rodriguez' interview to the newspaper YOMIURI was circulated among those present.

Komplektov, Yefimov Preview Visit

LD0104094389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2227 GMT 31 Mar 89

[Text] Havana, 1 Apr (TASS)—A press conference of Soviet experts took place in the international press center which has been set up to cover the official, friendly visit to the Republic of Cuba by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

V.G. Komplektov, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs; N.I. Yefimov, deputy head of the CPSU Central Committee Idealogical Department; and N.B. Bikkenin, chief editor of the journal KOMMUNIST; answered numerous questions from journalists connected with the forthcoming top-level visit, the contemporary state and the prospects for development of Soviet-Cuban relations, and USSR and Cuban foreign policy. They spoke about the campaign taking place in the Soviet Union for the election of people's deputies.

Komplektov Views Visit, Bush Message

PA0104031989 Madrid EFE in Spanish 2112 GMT 31 Mar 89

[Report by Silvia Odoriz]

[Text] Havana, 31 Mar (EFE)—During the first contacts between Soviet officials and intellectuals with the international press within the framework of the upcoming visit of Mikhail Gorbachev to Cuba, the USSR today reaffirmed its support for a Latin American solution to the Central American conflict.

At the Soviet-Cuban "summit" between Cuban President Fidel Castro and Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, which will begin 2 April in Havana, the two leaders will pay "attention to Latin America" in their agenda of international topics, Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Viktor Komplektov said at a news conference today.

Komplektov said that among the extraregional powers, the United States bears the "greatest responsibility" to create peaceful conditions in Central America, and described a message sent by U.S. President George Bush to Gorbachev as "unilateral and unclear."

The White House announced yesterday that Bush sent a message to Gorbachev asking him to take advantage of his trip to Cuba to make a contribution to peace in Central America and reduce its arms supplies to Nicaragua.

The crisis in Central America must be "controlled as soon as possible" through a Latin American and Central American solution, the high-ranking official said.

Nikolay Yefimov, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee's Ideological Department, refused to say whether Gorbachev will propose an expected Soviet initiative to help peace efforts in the Central American region.

"Be patient; if we say it all now, interest in the visit might be lost," he told reporters.

The USSR, Komplektov recalled, supports the Contadora Group's peace efforts, the Esquipulas II accords, and the most recent pact signed by the Central American presidents.

If the United States were willing to normalize its relations with Cuba, "we would vote for it with both hands," Komplektov said, in reply to a question on whether the USSR would support that possibility.

Cuba has shown its willingness to normalize its situation with the United States, he pointed out.

Komplektov mentioned Cuba's contribution to a political accord for South Africa by committing itself to withdraw its troops from Angola as an example of its "responsibility" and inclination toward peace.

As for the request by Cuba and other countries to democratize the UN Security Council, in which its permanent members—the United States, USSR, PRC, UK, and France—have veto power, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov said his country believes it is "premature" to review the UN Charter.

Komplektov said there has been a democratization of the United Nations, as reflected in the consultations at the council among permanent and nonpermanent members. The formula that was reached to deal with the Iran-Iraq conflict is an example of its good results. He added that there are "political and philosophical agreements" between Gorbachev and Castro. This was an attempt to deny speculation about differences between the two leaders over reforms under way in the USSR, which are known as perestroyka, and which the Cuban leader refuses to apply in his country.

The official insisted political relations between the two leaders are "most favorable" and that there are "personal ties" between them; however, he hinted that "some issues will be defined [concretar]," without saying which ones.

Yefimov said the USSR "feels great sympathy and admiration" for Cuba and recalled its "people's" revolution marked its 30th anniversary amid "difficult conditions."

Nevertheless, the country "maintains its dignity and is developing," although he admitted that, despite the accomplishments, not everything has been successful.

The participants in the news conference, including Naily Bikkenin, director of the CPSU's KOMMUNIST ideological magazine, commented at length on the results of recent legislative elections to select the new Congress of Deputies in the USSR.

They said this congress can convene in late May, once the election of deputies who were not elected during the first round is completed.

Referring to the 26 March elections, Yefimov said: "The people have supported the reforms and voted for them." He added that they are part of the policy of "renewal" currently under way in the USSR.

Bikkenin said the USSR "is reviewing its attitude toward Western democracy" and human rights.

He said if he were a CPSU leader who ran in the elections and lost, as has happened in a great majority of cases, he would resign his post, because it means he would lack popular support.

Gerasimov Views Visit

FL3103235289 Havana Radio Rebelde Network in Spanish 2327 GMT 31 Mar 89

[Text] Gennadiy Gerasimov, the man who is mentioned so frequently in the reports from Moscow because he is the official spokesman for the USSR Foreign Ministry, is in Havana with other Soviet officials on the occasion of Mikhail Gorbachev's visit scheduled to begin next Sunday.

In a meeting with the press accredited in Havana for the visit, Gerasimov said he felt great sympathy and admiration for Cuba, which in 30 years is showing unquestionable successes despite the economic blockade and other difficulties.

He also asserted that Gorbachev's visit will be followed with great interest by his fellow countrymen, and the Soviet press and television are already working in Havana for that purpose.

Viva the long unbreakable friendship between Cuba and the USSR.

Soviet Officials Discuss Cuba Trade

LD0104095289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0630 GMT 1 Apr 89

[Text] Havana, 1 Apr (TASS)—Questions of Soviet-Cuban economic and trade cooperation were at the focus of attention of the participants in a news conference on Friday [31 March] which took place at the international press center for coverage of the official, friendly visit to the Republic of Cuba by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, to the republic of Cuba.

Aleksandr Kachanov, USSR first deputy minister of foreign economic contacts; Herman Adamo Blanco, Cuban first deputy minister of foreign trade; and Raul Donas, deputy chairman of the State Committee on Economic Cooperation, told newsmen about the contemporary situation regarding Soviet-Cuban economic and trade relations.

The Cuban representatives noted that cooperation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries bears most important significance for the economy of the republic.

Cuban Publicist Views Ties

LD0204082989 Moscow TASS in English 0828 GMT 2 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow April 2 TASS—The forthcoming visit to Cuba by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev and his meeting with Fidel Castro and the Cuban people will undoubtedly become an event of special historical significance, Cuban publicist Juan Marrero writes in today's PRAVDA.

He refutes assertions by some Western analysts about certain contradictions and even antagonism which ostensibly exist in relations between the two socialist countries.

Such an estimate, the publicist points out, is none other than indulging in wishful thinking and a reflection of the oversimplified and very superficial view of things.

"Relations between our two countries and parties are historically based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian, socialist internationalism, which however has never excluded mutual respect for the differences of opinion and estimates of this or that specific situations."

The revitalisation process which has been taking place in Soviet society in recent years is worthy of great respect and sympathies. We are confident that in the final analysis it will strenthen the Soviet Union and the entire socialist world, Juan Marrero writes. Looking ridiculous are systematic attempts by the enemies of socialism to present different opinions which appear by virtue of different specific situations and conditions as a contradiction or antagonism, of which there are actually none.

The Cuban people shall always remember their indebtedness and gratitude to Soviet people, the Cuban publicist emphasizes. "We shall never forget the assistance which was given to Cuba in critical and decisive years when the country was facing hunger and destruction. Neither shall we forget the continous economic, scientific and technical cooperation with our country."

Havana Prepares for Visit

LD0204110689 Moscow TASS in English 1049 GMT 2 Apr 89

[Text] Havana April 2 TASS—By TASS special correspondent:

Huge streamers proclaiming in Spanish and Russian "Cuba-USSR: Brothers forever!" have appeared in various parts of Havana as the Cuban capital prepares to give welcome to Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev who arrives here today for an official friendly visit at the invitation of Cuban leader Fidel Castro.

"The welcome to Mikhail Gorbachev will become a vivid manifestation of fraternal friendship between the people of Cuban and the Soviet Union", GRANMA, newspaper of the Central Committee of the Cuban Communist Party Central Committee, writes on its front page.

The local press, radio and television emphasize with one accord that fruitful cooperation with the Soviet Union is of immense importance to Cuba.

This friendship originated thirty years ago at a time which was most difficult to the Cuban revolution. The Soviet Union extended a helping hand to the young republic to prevent a complete U.S. blockade of Cuba. The U.S. attempt to stifle the revolution by means of hunger and termination of the supply of oil and medicines was foiled. Cuban-Soviet friendship stood a serious test on the days of the Caribbean crisis.

Extensive trade and economic contacts between our two countries are now illustrated by the following figure: Reciprocal trade turnover in the current Five-Year Plan period will exceed 45,000 million roubles.

Soviet exports include more than 700 designations of commodities, laying a reliable foundation for the economic development of the fraternal socialist country. Cuba's requirements for fuel, for a greater part of cereals, metals, fertilizers, timber and many raw materials are fully met through Soviet deliveries.

For its part, Cuba supplies about 30 per cent of raw sugar being consumed in the Soviet Union, and nickel concentrte without which ferrous and non-ferrous metallurgy is inconceivable. Cuban citrus fruits, juices and jams have become a habitual part of the diet of many Soviet people. Products of the Cuban electronic industry are gradually winning a place on the Soviet market. On the whole, Cuba ranks sixth in the Soviet Union's aggregate trade turnover.

In an interview with Soviet journalists, Carlos Rafael Rodriguez, member of the Political Bureau of the Cuban Communist Party Central Committee, vice president of the Council of State and of the Council of Ministers of the republic, voiced firm confidence that Mikhail Gorbachev's forthcoming visit to Cuba would again reaffirm the invariable nature of friendship and cooperation between the two countries.

The Soviet leader will be able to see for himself, Rodriguez emphasized, that the Cuban people entertain genuine sympathies for him. This is accounted for primarily by the high evaluation of the vast amount of work

Gorbachev has done in recent years in the interests of bringing about positive changes in the world, eliminating confrontation and bettering mutual understanding among peoples.

The republic's central television network specially points out the fact that Cuba is the first Latin American country to be visited by the Soviet leader.

The international press centre, which opened in the city's largest Havana Libre Hotel to cover the Soviet leader's visit, is a hive of activity these days.

Soviet representatives—experts in the field of foreign policy and foreign economic cooperation who arrived here—told local and foreign journalists on Saturday about versatile cooperation between the two countries.

PCC Secretariat Member Hails Visit

LD0204140789 Moscow TASS in English 1314 GMT 2 Apr 89

[Text] Havana April 2 TASS—During the forthcoming official friendly visit to Cuba by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, the Cuban people will have an exceptional opportunity to express their gratitude to the Communist Party and people of the Soviet Union that gave a decisive support to the republic in the building of socialism, Carlos Aldana, member of the Secretariat of the Cuban Communist Party [PCC] Central Committee, said in a speech in Granma Municipality.

The Soviet leader's arrival, he said, will be of historic importance to relations between our two countries.

"Millions of Cubans are looking forward to Gorbachev's meeting with Fidel Castro", writes the newspaper TRABAJADORES in a leading article dealing with the Soviet leader's upcoming visit to Cuba. "The visit, which begins today, will reaffirm friendship which originated between our two countries thirty years ago upon the triumph of the Cuban Revolution."

"From the very first days of the revolution the Soviet people extended a helping hand to us and helped us to hold out in the conditions of the blockade mounted by the United States against Cuba," the article emphasizes.

"The Soviet Union became not only the guarantor of the survival of the young revolution but also gave the necessary material assistance for its development."

"Throughout the 30 years friendship and cooperation successfully stood the test at the most decisive and difficult moments of our history. Throughout the 30 years, there has been fruitful mutual understanding between our two countries", TRABAJADORES emphasizes.

"Gorbachev's and Castro's meeting will take place despite imperialism's attempts at interfering in bilateral relations and at hindering our plans for the building of a new society", writes TRABAJADORES, newspaper of the trade union centre of the working people of Cuba.

According to reports from Caracas, Carlos Perez del Castillo, permanent secretary of the Latin American economic system, has stated here that Gorbachev's upcoming official friendly visit to Cuba is highly positive not only for the development of relations between the two countries but also for the expansion of the Soviet Union's contacts with Latin American countries and those from other continents.

He voiced firm confidence that the visit would contribute to strengthening the process of integration taking place in Latin America.

Cuba-USSR Amity Chief Lauds Visit

PM0204135789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Apr 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Special correspondents B. Vasiliyev, A. Kamorin report: "Cuba Is Getting Ready for the Visit"]

[Excerpts] In the House of Cuban-Soviet Friendship in Havana a ceremony took place, devoted to the publication in Spanish of a collection of speeches by M.S. Gorbachev, entitled "The New Stage of Restructuring." Meetings devoted to the publication of new books are traditional in Cuba, and announcements about such meetings can be found in the local newspapers several times a week. Nonetheless, this time the ceremony of presenting the slim volume in a yellow and lilac cover was somehow special. The interest in the changes taking place in our country is very great here. And since the announcement this spring of the upcoming visit of the Soviet leader, Cubans have been paying particularly close attention to the USSR.

Commenting on our observation, Professor Zoilo Marinello, president of the Cuban-Soviet Friendship Association, said:

"The approaching visit of M.S. Gorbachev has added new color to the traditional friendship between our peoples. We are aware of the warmth with which Comrade Gorbachev refers to Cuba in his speeches, and we know about the close contacts that have been established between him and the leaders of our revolution. However, indirect acquaintance is not a real acquaintance. It is necessary for Comrade Gorbachev to come and see our country for himself, to see our culture and our national character. This is very important for the further development of ties. I am confident that we will find a common language. Many of our guest's character traits are close to the Cuban people's hearts—his energy, his temperament as an orator, his constant endeavor to maintain live contact with people, and his focus on change. Naturally, we want to hear a first-hand account of the progress of Soviet restructuring. And we are no less interested in hearing M.S. Gorbachev's opinion about the process of renewal that is under way in Cuba."

The professor's words reflect the opinions of millions of our Cuban friends. In actual fact, the exchange of experience between our fraternal countries is to form the main content of the upcoming visit—Comrade Gorbachev's first visit to Cuba.

The Cuban process of purification (this is the short name for the program of rectification of past mistakes and elimination of negative phenomena put forward by the Third Congress of the Communist Party of Cuba [PCC]) is often compared by our Western colleagues with the Soviet restructuring, and when they find no direct parallels they talk about "contradictions" between the two countries. This approach is fundamentally wrong. Every socialist state has its own experience of successes and mistakes and its own conditions—historical, external, and domestic—and each party has its own views concerning the tactics and strategy of development.

In 1986 the PCC exposed and analyzed a number of negative phenomena in the economy—negative phenomena that had various causes, including noncritical adoption of other socialist countries' experience. Insufficient growth in export potential and excessive reliance on imports were criticized. Defects were also exposed in implementation of the principle of payment according to work, as the system of norms had become too unwieldy and a large number of norms were clearly obsolete. The system of planning and national economic management that had been in operation in the country for many years was not flawless and did not fully accord with Cuba's specific conditions. Instances of squandered resources and all kinds of abuses perpetrated for personal gain had increased.

Elimination of the causes of these negative trends constitutes the substance of the purification process. It is a highly original process, as the very leadership that accepted responsibility for the mistakes committed is acting as the initiator of rectification of those mistakes. Stringent measures to economize on resources, especially currency resources, were adopted. As a result of a rationalization of the norm system, average wages at enterprises, where unjustified payments were exposed, have decreased sharply, but these steps do not signify a departure from the principles of material incentives, as is often claimed in the West. The main levers of change are the Cuban people's enthusiasm, selflessness, and revolutionary consciousness. The leadership has deemed it necessary to purge the economy of elements inherited from capitalism. So, for instance, peasant markets have been closed down and an additional network of state procurement depots set up to buy choice produce from individual peasants. [passage omitted]

The most important news in Cuba today is anything connected with the upcoming visit of the Soviet leader. The hall of the capital's "Habana Libre" Hotel, where the official opening of the international press center was held, was filled to capacity. It is expected that more than 500 journalists will descend on Havana, and live television broadcasts are planned. The schedule of the visit will be tight. Yu.V. Petrov, Soviet ambassador to Cuba, announced at the opening ceremony that the visit is expected to end with the signing of a Soviet-Cuban treaty of friendship and cooperation. Foreign correspondents received this news as the first sensation of the upcoming visit.

Castro Message Welcomes Gorbachev

LD0204151889 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1503 GMT 2 Apr 89

[Text] Havana, 2 April (TASS)—The Cuban press today published Fidel Castro's message to M.S. Gorbachev in connection with the Soviet leader's official friendly visit to the Republic of Cuba. It states:

"Dear Comrade Gorbachev, I am impatiently awaiting your arrival on Cuba. Havana is enthusiastically preparing to give you the warmest welcome. We are very grateful to you for deciding, despite your heavy workload, to carry out within a short time the visit that was postponed in December. I can assure you in advance that you will feel good in our country, and that the results of your trip will be constructive and useful to the highest degree.

"The flight across the Atlantic Ocean is a long one, but the hours spent in Cuba will most probably seem short both to us, and to you. I embrace you in advance."

PRAVDA Reporters View Cooperation With Cuba

LD0304081589 Moscow TASS in English 0640 GMT 3 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow April 3 TASS—In a reportage contributed to the newspaper PRAVDA on Monday, [3 April] its special correspondents write about many-sided, steadily growing Soviet-Cuban cooperation. PRAVDA printed their reportage on the day the Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev has begun his official friendly visit to the Republic of Cuba.

The Soviet Union has always been siding with the fraternal country since the Cuban revolution victory, the correspondents say. They write in detail about the stages of development of Soviet-Cuban cooperation, stressing that "Soviet economic and technical assistance is helping strengthen and broaden the material-technical basis of the production of traditional Cuban export commodities; new branches of Cuba's economy, just non-existent before the revolution, have become well-developed, for instance, agricultural machine-building, have become well-developed, for instance, agricultural machine-building, manufacture of sugar-industry equipment and electronics, production of fertilisers, commercial fishing. Over 600 various structures of national economic significance have been built, reconstructed or are under construction with Soviet assistance. Over 400 of them have already been put into exploitation".

"Trade between the two countries is growing from year to year", the PRAVDA special corresponents said in their reportage. "Soviet exports to Cuba include about 700 denominations of commodities. Cuba meets about 30 percent of the USSR's requirements in raw sugar. Soviet consumers know well the high quality of Cuban citrus fruits, Soviet ferrous and nonferrous enterprises receive nickel from the freedom island".

"Over a third of Cuban candidates and doctors of sciences defended dissertations in the USSR", the correspondents said, featuring scientific-technological cooperation between the two countries. "Joint selection work enabled Cuban friends to evolve more productive varieties of Cuba's staple agricultural crop—sugar cane, and also varieties of rice and vegetables resistant to various diseases. Serious joint scientific-technological work is also under way in metallurgy, geology, genetics, peaceful uses of atomic energy".

Manuel Menendez, director of the MILITANTE COMMUNISTA, a monthly issued by the Secretariat of the Central Committee of Cuba's Communist Party, had this to say in an interview to the PRAVDA correspondents, expressing Cubans' sentiments on the eve of Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to the country:

"I think that Comrade Gorbachev's visit to Cuba will promote a qualitatively new stage in bringing our parties and peoples closer together. Fidel Castro and Mikhail Gorbachev will have their third meeting. They twice met in Moscow for a dialogue and now will discuss all major problems in Cuba for the first time. The cause of my sincere joy is that the political leaders will represent two revolutionary processes—the Cuban 'rectification' and Soviet perestroyka, which undoubtedly differ from each other but pursue a common goal. On his arrival in Havana, Comrade Gorbachev wil get to know our realities better, he will see with his own eyes concrete deeds of Cuban working people who are building socialism. He will have a possibility to directly communicate with the Cuban people", he said.

U.S. Criticized for Its 'Unchanged' Cuba Policy

PA3003214189 Moscow in Spanish to Latin America 2300 GMT 29 Mar 89

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] Just a few days remain before Supreme Soviet Presidium Chairman Mikhail Gorbachev makes an official visit to Cuba. This is why everything that has to do with this Caribbean country gets full attention from our station and other international media.

According to reports by various press agencies, U.S. Secretary of State James Baker told the corps of U.S. ambassadors to the Latin American countries that Washington's policy toward Cuba will remain unchanged until Cuba changes its conduct. This fact brings to mind sad thoughts.

Every year, the world around us changes. Lately, promising tendencies have manifested themselves in the field of international relations. The new political mentality becomes ever more vigorous, and new criteria on many old problems are beginning to develop and bear the first fruits. [Words indistinct] as soon as the conversation turns to Cuba, they come out with the worn-out accusations that Cuba exports revolution, violates human rights, etcetera. These accusations concerning arms shipments to Colombian and Salvadoran guerrillas, political prisoners in Cuba, and other fabrications are plain lies that have been repeatedly refuted.

For 3 decades now, from the very day the Cuban revolution was triumphant, the administration has been deaf to the public's calls for a review of the totally bankrupt anti-Cuban U.S. policy and for a sensible approach toward the neighboring country in light of current realities. By all accounts, the U.S. Administration cannot break free from the bonds of imperialist ambitions and concepts and cannot accept that Cuba has become a totally independent and sovereign nation that conducts a policy to further its own interests rather than those of a foreign country.

Political & Social

Central Committee Agrarian Plenum Resolution

PM3103165189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
1 Apr 89 First Edition pp 1, 3

[CPSU Central Committee plenum resolution of 16 March 1989: "On CPSU Agrarian Policy Under Present-Day Conditions"]

[Text] 1. The CPSU Central Committee plenum notes that delay in resolving the food problem is impermissible and that the serious lagging behind the present-day demands in developing the country's agro-industrial complex and rural working people's living conditions require fundamental changes to CPSU agrarian policy.

Having listened to and discussed the report "On CPSU Agrarian Policy Under Present-Day Conditions" by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, the plenum notes the fundamental importance of the report's political conclusions, which reveal the party's new agrarian policy. A central position in this policy is taken up by the restructuring of socialist production relations in the countryside and the reinstating of peasants as masters of the land with a vested interest in boosting production and enhancing the quality of what is produced.

On the basis of combining the radical transformations in economic relations with the acceleration of scientific and technical progress and of the social reorganization [pereustroystvo] of the countryside, there is an emergent opportunity in the very near future to reduce the acuteness of the food problem and to ensure production of enough agricultural products in the 13th 5-Year Plan to provide stable food supplies to the population.

The CPSU Central Committee proceeds on the basis that the implementation of the new agrarian policy will make it possible to boost Soviet people's prosperity, to strengthen the alliance between working class, peasantry, and intelligentsia, and to take an important step forward in overcoming the substantive differences between city and countryside.

2. The plenum approves the assessments, made in M.S. Gorbachev's report, of agrarian policy at the various stages of the country's development, and the lessons that have been drawn from them. These show that many age-old problems in agricultural development are rooted in the major errors and blunders committed during the period of the countryside's reorganization in the thirties, in the distortion of the Leninist principles of the cooperative system, in the ignoring of the instructive experience of its development during the New Economic Policy period, and in the unjustified expediting of collectivization based on exceptional measures of a coercive nature. All this left a negative imprint on subsequent stages of agricultural development, held back the revelation of the immense potential of the collective farm [kolkhoz] and state farm [sovkhoz] system, and led to an increase in management-by-edict leadership methods. The shackling of peasants' initiative and enterprise, the unjustified confiscation of a considerable proportion of their monetary and material resources, and the violation of equivalent exchange between city and countryside undermined the foundations of expanded reproduction in agriculture and led to the alienation of rural working people from the land and other means of production.

Analysis of the development of agriculture makes it possible to conclude that the agrarian policy of previous years failed to produce the requisite results because its formulation and implementation took place without taking account of the need to improve production and economic relations and develop the peasant's personal interest in farming results. The attempts that were made to change the agrarian policy, renounce the administrative-edict system of management, and enhance agricultural workers' economic vested interest, were half-hearted and inconsistent, and produced only temporary results. Despite increasing investments in the agro-industrial complex and the consolidation of its material and technical base, the breakthrough in the development of agriculture and the requisite improvement in food supplies to the country's population were not forthcoming.

3. The CPSU Central Committee plenum believes that it is essential to change economic relations in the countryside, basing them on a consistent switch of kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and other agro-industrial complex enterprises to principles of economic accountability and self-financing, and on the application of leasing as the form of socialist relations which accords most fully with the demands for a harmonious combination of the interests of citizens, labor collectives, and society as a whole.

The development of leasing relations in the work of kolkhozes, sovkhozes, other agro-industrial enterprises and their structural subdivisions, and of individual citizens, is capable of ensuring in practice a sharp rise in labor productivity and output quality. The implementation of socialist ownership via leasing must be carried out on a long-term and strictly voluntary basis.

The current agrarian policy is called upon to ensure a resolute transition to the development of agro-industrial production on the basis of diverse forms of socialist ownership and different types of economic activity by kolkhozes, sovkhozes, agro-industrial combines, agricultural firms, processing and other enterprises, leasing collectives and lessees, peasant holdings and their cooperatives, and citizens' personal subsidiary plots. It is important to create for them equitable economic conditions and the appropriate organizational prerequisites necessary to enhance their economic efficiency and develop their independence and initiative in work. It is necessary to adopt measures to ensure the further utilization of the production potential of kolkhozes and sovkhozes and their development as associations of cooperative members and lessees.

The development of personal subsidiary plots and their integration with public production on the basis of contracts concluded with kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and consumer cooperatives demands constant attention. It is necessary to remove unjustified restrictions on the allocation of farming, truck farming, and orchard plots to applicants, and to assist in every way the establishment of cooperatives for rendering assistance to citizens in the production and marketing of produce.

It is incumbent upon the soviets of people's deputies to ensure that all forms of farming mutually complement each other and interact closely with each other with a view to achieving accelerated growth of the country's food resources output.

4. The CPSU Central Committee plenum believes that it is essential to adopt exhaustive measures to master the new mechanism of economic activity at all levels of production, management, and planning in the agrarian sphere. With a view to the further democratization of the procedure for the compilation of plans, kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and other agricultural enterprises must be given the right, independently, taking account of the proposals of contract and leasing collectives, to determine the production structure, volume of output sales, and other production and economic indicators, and also to dispose of the produced output and of economically accountable income as they see fit.

The CPSU Central Committee plenum emphasizes that the granting of autonomy to kolkhozes and sovkhozes and peasants' holdings and the broad development of lease relations creates opportunities in the future to purchase on contractual basis those categories of agricultural produce in the requisite volumes necessary to create the state food stocks. Bearing in mind that a transition period will be inevitable between the present situation and the time when the new economic mechanism will start operating at full force, the diverse forms of attracting produce into centralized stocks, including state orders, must be utilized within its framework. State orders must be determined on the basis of normatives which would remain fixed for a 5-year period, and there must be no room for high-pressure methods of procurement. Purchasing discipline must be closely interlinked with the performance of reciprocal contractual obligations on the basis of economic liability both of producers and of procurers of produce.

Following the discharge of contractual obligations, producers will sell any remaining part of the produce at their own discretion—to those selfsame procurement or trade organizations, processing enterprises, or consumer cooperatives, or on the kolkhoz market, or to public catering in order to improve local supplies.

The core issue of the new economic mechanism must be the creation of an interlinked price system for agro-industrial complex products, encouraging all its elements to aim for high end results and creating conditions for work by agricultural and processing enterprises in line with the principles of economic accountability and self-financing. It is necessary to ensure a more flexible combination of centralized principles in price formation with broader rights of local organs and enterprises in this sphere and broader utilization of contractual and independently set prices.

It must be deemed necessary to set standard firm purchasing prices for the basic categories of agricultural products for the 5-year period, taking their quality into consideration. At the same time, it must be deemed expedient that prices for fruit and vegetable produce and potatoes should be set on a contractual basis proceeding from the specific features of the production and marketing of this produce. The right should be reserved for local organs to set, whenever necessary, maximum retail prices for this produce.

When implementing the new price policy it is necessary to ensure price parity between industrial and agricultural production and to create mechanisms to maintain this parity. The mutual relations of farms and enterprises in the agrarian sphere with the budget must be formed on a long-term normative basis and the development of expanded reproduction must be comprehensively promoted.

It is deemed necessary to implement measures to improve the financial position of enterprises and organizations in the agro-industrial complex, to strengthen the economy of low-profit and loss-making kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and processing and other enterprises, and to improve payment discipline so that their work ceases to be loss-making in the next 2 years. For this they must each have a concrete program of development. In instances where the measures that are being taken fail to ensure the profitable working of loss-making farms they may be reorganized or wound up in the prescribed manner and their land transferred to other kolkhozes, sovkhozes, industrial enterprises, cooperative lease collectives, and peasant holdings.

5. The Central Committee plenum deems it important to continue to comprehensively strengthen the material and technical base of the agro-industrial complex on the basis of creating systems of highly productive machines and improving the quality of machinery, equipment, and all the means of production supplied to the countryside. It is necessary to organize the assimilation and production of the means of mechanization based on the demand for them expressed by peasant holdings, lease collectives, citizens' personal subsidiary plots, and horticultural and truck farming societies.

Kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and other enterprises in agriculture and the processing sphere must allocate material and financial resources in quantities sufficient to ensure the planned rate of growth of production of agricultural output and foodstuffs. To increase the efficiency of use of resources it is deemed expedient to change the structure of investments, considerably increasing capital investments in the processing of products, the social development of the countryside, and road building.

6. The CPSU Central Committee plenum supports local proposals on the need to fundamentally reorganize management in the agro-industrial complex and to completely eliminate command and administrative methods of leadership and interference from above in economic activity. Organs of management of the main production link must be formed according to principles stemming from the need to develop multifarious forms of economic activity and the flexible combination of various forms of ownership on a strictly voluntary basis in the light of the broad democratization of production relations and self-management. In rayons, oblasts, krays, and autonomous republics it is expedient to have councils, unions, associations, and amalgamations [obyedineniye] elected by labor collectives and designed to provide services to production on cooperative principles. In union republics the kind of organs of management of the agro-industrial complex must be formed equipped with the necessary functions which will ensure the rapid growth of the production of output and the material and technical support for enterprises in agriculture and the processing industry.

In connection with the transfer of agro-industrial production functions to the union republics it is considered necessary to radically restructure the system of management of the agro-industrial complex at the union level—to form a USSR Council of Ministers State Commission for Food and Purchases as a permanent organ of the USSR Government, having abolished the USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee.

7. It is deemed advisable to implement during 1989-1995 a targeted program for the social reorganization of the countryside with due regard for the comprehensive development of the regions' economy such that the city and the countryside, industry and agriculture develop in an intercoordinated way on a strictly balanced basis.

Work on housing and road construction and the comprehensive development of the countryside is to be stepped up. Every rural family is to be provided with the opportunity to have a separate well-appointed apartment or house. The equipping of the housing stock and of cultural and consumer establishments with the necessary utilities services is to be improved considerably. Extensive use is to be made of the development of subsidiary production facilities and undertakings to expand the sphere of application of labor in rural localities.

8. The CPSU Central Committee plenum considers it necessary to concentrate the attention of Communists, party organizations, soviet and economic organs, and research and planning and design collectives on improving all work on accelerating scientific and technical progress in the country's agro-industrial complex. Production of agricultural and food products is to be raised to a qualitatively new technological level.

The leaders of the appropriate ministries and departments are required to substantially rectify the state of affairs before the end of the current 5-year plan and, in the 13th 5-Year Plan, by and large to complete the retooling of food industry enterprises and their fitting out with modern equipment. Medium- and small-capacity enterprises are to be created, in addition to large ones, for the processing and storage of products, and they are to be sited closer to the sources of agricultural raw materials.

Improved soil fertility and the protection of soil against erosion are to be ensured on the basis of the latest achievements of science and progressive practice in crop farming, land reclamation, and chemicalization, and with regard for zonal features.

Measures are to be taken to widely master intensive methods of producing livestock products, above all by means of strengthening the feed base and resolving the protein problem, and radically improving selection and pedigree breeding.

The level of basic and applied research and of all scientific backup for the agro-industrial complex is to be enhanced, science-and-production systems, associations, and complexes are to be developed in every possible way to resolve specific tasks of meeting the country's food and raw material needs, the implementation of scientific developments in the spheres of economics, biotechnology, agricultural genetics, electronics, and ecology is to be accelerated, and their efficiency is to be enhanced. The transfer of scientific establishments to economic accountability is to be completed.

9. The CPSU Central Committee plenum emphasizes that the practical implementation of modern agrarian policy and the resolution of the food question are a very important area of the restructuring under way in the country. Union republic Communist Party central committees and kray, oblast, city, okrug, and rayon party committees are to arrange their organizational and political work in such a way that all the party's forces and the broad masses of working people are actively involved in realizing this priority task.

It is important to mobilize more fully the cities' industrial and intellectual potential for the retooling and social development of labor collectives in the agrarian sphere.

The primary party organizations of enterprises in the agro-industrial complex are obliged to promote the democratization of production life and the active transfer of basic production links to the principles of economic accountability, self-financing, and self-management. Rural rayon party committees have a significant role in this. The chief thing for them is to resolutely overcome the command style, fully master methods of political leadership, be closer to people, and help them to reveal their potential under the new conditions of economic activity.

Cadres of the country's agro-industrial complex and the molding of the new thinking in leaders and specialists essential for effective implementation of the party's agrarian policy in modern conditions should be the object of constant attention and concern by party, soviet, and economic organs. Relying on the electivity of cadres, it is necessary to seek to ensure that their composition is stable and that their responsibility is increased and to organize the training and retraining of lessees and cooperative members—the new generation of Soviet peasants. It is necessary to give encouragement to those city-dwellers who want to and who are prepared to resettle in the countryside and take part in tackling its tasks in the interests of the whole country.

The plenum considers that the role of soviets in implementing the agrarian policy should be enhanced. Receiving real power in the course of the political reform, they must work in a new way and solve on their own all questions concerned with ensuring the population's food supply that fall within their competence. Special attention should be paid to developing social infrastructure, to equipping villages and improving standards there, creating favorable working and living conditions, and consistently implementing nature-conservancy measures.

Trade unions, the Komsomol, and all public organizations in the country must play an active role in carrying out the topical tasks of developing the agro-industrial complex.

10. Approbation should be given to the CPSU Central Committee Politburo proposal on the need to adopt USSR Council of Ministers resolutions on the radical restructuring of economic relations, on the social reorganization of the countryside, on the development of leasing, and on the improvement of the country's food supply on the basis of increased efficiency of agroindustrial production aimed at the practical implementation of CPSU agrarian policy under present-day conditions.

The CPSU Central Committee Plenum urges Communists and all labor collectives to play an active part in the practical implementation of the party's agrarian policy. The firm establishment of new economic relations, radical transformation of social conditions of life in the countryside, extensive mastery of the achievements of scientific and technical progress in this vitally important sphere of the economy, and the development of democracy and self-management by the people will help ensure that the agro-industrial complex is quickly raised to a qualitatively new level of development.

Moscow Okrug Election Results Detailed

PM3103160089 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 28 Mar 89 pp 1-2

["Reports of Okrug Electoral Commissions of Moscow City Territorial Electoral Okrugs for Elections of USSR People's Deputies"]

[Text]

Leninskiy Okrug No 1

There were 212,444 people on the list of voters, of whom 183,804, or 86.52 percent of the okrug's total number of voters, took part in the voting.

97,890 voters, or 53.26 percent, voted for candidate deputy Aleksey Mikhaylovich Yemelyanov. 82,647 voters, or 44.96 percent, voted against the candidate.

69,982 voters, or 38.07 percent, voted for candidate deputy Valeriy Mikhaylovich Savitskiy. 110,555 voters, or 60.15 percent, voted against the candidate.

The number of ballot papers deemed invalid was 3,267.

On the basis of the results of the vote, Comrade Aleksey Mikhaylovich Yemelyanov, head of the agricultural economics department of the M.V. Lomonosov Moscow State University, CPSU member, who lives in Gagarinskiy Rayon, Moscow, was elected USSR people's deputy, having received the votes of more than half the voters who took part in the voting.

Babushkinskiy Okrug No 2

There were 267,514 people on the list of voters, of whom 222,840, or 83.3 percent of the okrug's total number of voters, took part in the voting.

100,066 voters, or 44.9 percent, voted for candidate deputy Yuriy Emanuilovich Andreyev. 116,236 voters, or 52.16 percent, voted against the candidate.

68,176 voters, or 30.59 percent, voted for candidate deputy Valeriy Nikolayevich Ryzhakov. 148,126 voters, or 66.47 percent, voted against the candidate.

34,588 voters, or 15.52 percent, voted for candidate deputy Viktor Mikhaylovich Chepkin. 181,714 voters, or 81.54 percent, voted against the candidate.

The number of ballot papers deemed invalid was 6,185.

Since no candidate deputy received the votes of more than half the voters who took part in the voting, the okrug electoral commission decided to hold a runoff on 9 April 1989 between the two candidate deputies: Yuriy Emanuilovich Andreyev and Valeriy Nikolayevich Ryzhakov, who received the largest number of votes.

Baumanskiy Okrug No 3

There were 215,405 people on the list of voters, of whom 183,910, or 85.38 percent of the okrug's total number of voters, took part in the voting.

50,609 voters, or 27.52 percent, voted for candidate deputy Yevgeniy Olegovich Adamov. 130,000 voters, or 70.69 percent, voted against the candidate.

117,705 voters, or 64.0 percent, voted for candidate deputy Aleksandr Nikolayevich Krayko. 62,904 voters, or 34.2 percent, voted against the candidate.

The number of ballot papers deemed invalid was 3,301.

On the basis of the results of the vote, Comrade Aleksandr Nikolayevich Krayko, chief of department at a branch of the P.I. Baranov Aircraft Engine Building Institute, nonparty person, who lives in Kalininskiy Rayon, Moscow, was elected USSR people's deputy, having received the votes of more than half the voters who took part in the voting.

Veshnyakovskiy Okrug No 4

There were 139,236 people on the list of voters, of whom 117,406, or 84.32 percent of the okrug's total number of voters, took part in the voting.

36,588 voters, or 31.16 percent, voted for candidate deputy Yuriy Ivanovich Afonin. 77,621 voters, or 66.11 percent, voted against the candidate.

66,431 voters, or 56.58 percent, voted for candidate deputy Viktor Aleksandrovich Tsyurupa. 47,778 voters, or 40.69 percent, voted against the candidate.

The number of ballot papers deemed invalid was 3,197.

On the basis of the results of the vote, Comrade Viktor Aleksandrovich Tsyurupa, chief of department at the No 15 City Clinical Hospital, nonparty person, who lives in Perovskiy Rayon, Moscow, was elected USSR people's deputy, having received the votes of more than half the voters who took part in the voting.

Volgogradskiy Okrug No 5

There were 264,528 people on the list of voters, of whom 224,079, or 84.71 percent of the okrug's total number of voters, took part in the voting.

112,498 voters, or 50.15 percent, voted for candidate deputy Nikolay Sergeyevich Mironov. 105,902 voters, or 47.21 percent, voted against the candidate.

77,452 voters, or 34.53 percent, voted for candidate deputy Viktor Aleksandrovich Teleshov. 140,948 voters, or 62.84 percent, voted against the candidate.

The number of ballot papers deemed invalid was 5,679.

On the basis of the results of the vote, Comrade Nikolay Sergeyevich Mironov, CPSU member, general director of the "Molniya Mashinostroitelnyy Zavod" Production Association, who lives in Volgogradskiy Rayon, Moscow, was elected USSR people's deputy, having received the votes of more than half the voters who took part in the voting.

Voroshilovskiy Okrug No 6

There were 257,433 people on the list of voters, of whom 219,023, or 85.08 percent of the okrug's total number of voters, took part in the voting.

22,925 voters, or 10.47 percent, voted for candidate deputy Nikolay Ivanovich Volkov. 185,821 voters, or 84.84 percent, voted against the candidate.

13,291 voters, or 6.07 percent, voted for candidate deputy Yuriy Alekseyevich Kozlov. 195,455 voters, or 89.24 percent, voted against the candidate.

76,270 voters, or 34.82 percent, voted for candidate deputy Roy Aleksandrovich Medvedev. 132,476 voters, or 60.49 percent, voted against the candidate.

38,756 voters, or 17.69 percent, voted for candidate deputy Kseniya Aleksandrovna Razumova. 169,990 voters, or 77.61 percent, voted against the candidate.

17,778 voters, or 8.12 percent, voted for candidate deputy Valentin Ilich Titov. 190,968 voters, or 87.19 percent, voted against the candidate.

29,608 voters, or 13.52 percent, voted for candidate deputy Lyudmila Pavlovna Shurygina. 179,138 voters, or 81.79 percent, voted against the candidate.

The number of ballot papers deemed invalid was 10,277.

Since no candidate deputy received the votes of more than half the voters who took part in the voting, the okrug electoral commission decided to hold a runoff on 9 April 1989 between the two candidate deputies: Roy Aleksandrovich Medvedev and Kseniya Aleksandrovna Razumova, who received the largest number of votes.

Gagarinskiy Okrug No 7

There were 314,927 people on the list of voters, of whom 265,497, or 84.3 percent of the okrug's total number of voters, took part in the voting.

57,978 voters, or 21.84 percent, voted for candidate deputy Gennadiy Konstantinovish Ashin. 195,026 voters, or 73.46 percent, voted against the candidate.

6,213 voters, or 2.3 percent, voted for candidate deputy Aleksandr Yefimovich Beylinson. 246,791 voters, or 92.95 percent, voted against the candidate.

13,079 voters, or 4.9 percent, voted for candidate deputy Dmitriy Antonovich Volkogonov. 239,925 voters, or 90.37 percent, voted against the candidate.

1,082 voters, or 0.41 percent, voted for candidate deputy Farit Ganiyevich Yengurazov. 251,922 voters, or 94.89 percent, voted against the candidate.

4,694 voters, or 1.77 percent, voted for candidate deputy Anatoliy Sergeyevich Kaledin. 248,310 voters, or 93.53 percent, voted against the candidate.

10,881 voters, or 4.1 percent, voted for candidate deputy Aleksey Arkhipovich Leonov. 242,123 voters, or 91.2 percent, voted against the candidate.

1,735 voters, or 0.65 percent, voted for candidate deputy Vitaliy Ivanovich Momot. 251,269 voters, or 94.64 percent, voted against the candidate.

7,095 voters, or 2.67 percent, voted for candidate deputy Vladimir Vasilyevich Pletnev. 245,909 voters, or 92.62 percent, voted against the candidate.

2,220 voters, or 0.84 percent, voted for candidate deputy Gennadiy Ivanovich Plotitsyn. 250,784 voters, or 94.46 percent, voted against the candidate.

24,411 voters, or 9.19 percent, voted for candidate deputy Eldar Aleksandrovich Ryazanov. 228,593 voters, or 86.1 percent, voted against the candidate.

11,521 voters, or 4.34 percent, voted for candidate deputy Yevgeniy Grigoryevich Sologubov. 241,483 voters, or 90.96 percent, voted against the candidate.

102,870 voters, or 38.75 percent, voted for candidate deputy Yuriy Dmitriyevich Chernichenko. 150,134 voters, or 56.55 percent, voted against the candidate.

The number of ballot papers deemed invalid was 12,493.

Since no candidate deputy received the votes of more than half the voters who took part in the voting, the okrug electoral commission decided to hold a runoff on 9 April 1989 between the two candidate deputies: Yuriy Dmitriyevich Chernichenko and Gennadiy Konstantinovich Ashin, who received the largest number of votes.

Kantemirovskiy Okrug No 8

There were 259,552 people on the list of voters, of whom 220,621, or 85.00 percent of the okrug's total number of voters, took part in the voting.

123,327 voters, or 55.90 percent, voted for candidate deputy Vladimir Nikitich Belyayev. 92,379 voters, or 41.87 percent, voted against the candidate.

71,710 voters, or 32.50 percent, voted for candidate deputy Vladimir Georgiyevich Tsarkov. 143,996 voters, or 65.27 percent, voted against the candidate.

The number of ballot papers deemed invalid was 4,915.

On the basis of the results of the vote, Comrade Vladimir Nikitich Belyayev, dean of the Moscow Physical Engineering Institute, CPSU member, who lives in Krasnogvardeyskiy Rayon, Moscow, was elected USSR people's deputy, having received the votes of more than half the voters who took part in the voting.

Kirovskiy Okrug No 9

There were 192,083 people on the list of voters, of whom 155,857, or 81.14 percent of the okrug's total number of voters, took part in the voting.

103,511 voters, or 66.41 percent, voted for candidate deputy Aleksandr Nikolayevich Kuzmin. 49,102 voters, or 31.50 percent, voted against the candidate.

33,619 voters, or 21.57 percent, voted for candidate deputy Aleksandr Sergeyevish Sarzhin. 118,994 voters, or 76.34 percent, voted against the candidate.

The number of ballot papers deemed invalid was 3,244.

On the basis of the results of the vote, Comrade Aleksandr Nikolayevich Kuzmin, sector chief at the Central Automatic and Hydraulic Equipment Research Institute, nonparty person, who lives in Cheremushkinskiy Rayon, Moscow, was elected USSR people's deputy, having received the votes of more than half the voters who took part in the voting.

Krasnogvardeyskiy Okrug No 10

There were 220,165 people on the list of voters, of whom 185,699, or 84.35 percent of the okrug's total number of voters, took part in the voting.

133,001 voters, or 71.62 percent, voted for candidate deputy Valentin Ivanovich Dikul. 49,049 voters, or 26.41 percent, voted against the candidate.

25,675 voters, or 13.83 percent, voted for candidate deputy Aleksandr Ivanovich Popov. 156,375 voters, or 84.21 percent, voted against the candidate.

The number of ballot papers deemed invalid was 3,649.

On the basis of the results of the vote, Comrade Valentin Ivanovich Dikul, director of the All-Union Center for the Rehabilitation of Patients Suffering From Spinal and

Brain Injuries and the Consequences of Infantile Cerebral Palsy and circus artist, nonparty person, who lives in Krasnogvardeyskiy Rayon, was elected USSR people's deputy, having received the votes of more than half the voters who took part in the voting.

Krasnopresnenskiy Okrug No 11

There were 236,101 people on the list of voters, of whom 197,426, or 83.62 percent of the okrug's total number of voters, took part in the voting.

37,282 voters, or 18.88 percent, voted for candidate deputy Svetlana Vasilyevna Geraskina. 154,729 voters, or 78.37 percent, voted against the candidate.

58,889 voters, or 29.83 percent, voted for candidate deputy Anatoliy Ivanovich Kanashchenkov. 133,122 voters, or 67.43 percent, voted against the candidate.

67,118 voters, or 34.00 percent, voted for candidate deputy Viktor Nikolayvich Yaroshenko. 124,893 voters, or 63.26 percent, voted against the candidate.

The number of ballot papers deemed invalid was 5,415.

Since no candidate deputy received the votes of more than half the voters who took part in the voting, the okrug electoral commission decided to hold a runoff on 9 April 1989 between the two candidate deputies: Anatoliy Ivanovich Kanashenkov and Viktor Nikolayevich Yaroshchenko, who received the largest number of votes.

Kuybyshevskiy Okrug No 12

There were 274,427 people on the list of voters, of whom 226,638, or 82.6 percent of the okrug's total number of voters, took part in the voting.

118,001 voters, or 52.1 percent, voted for candidate deputy Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Kazamarov. 103,990 voters, or 45.9 percent, voted against the candidate.

56,533 voters, or 24.9 percent, voted for candidate deputy Vladimir Ivanovich Markov. 165,458 voters, or 73.01 percent, voted against the candidate.

30,665 voters, or 13.53 percent, voted for candidate deputy Yuriy Anatolyevich Prokofyev. 191,396 voters, or 84.45 percent, voted against the candidate.

The number of ballot papers deemed invalid was 4,647.

On the basis of the results of the vote, Comrade Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Kazamarov, CPSU member, section chief designer and deputy general director for scientific work of a science and production association, who lives in Sokolnicheskiy Rayon, Moscow, was elected USSR people's deputy, having received the votes of more than half the voters who took part in the voting.

Kuntsevskiy Okrug No 13

There were 295,459 people on the list of voters, of whom 249,175, or 84.33 percent of the okrug's total number of voters, took part in the voting.

109,582 voters, or 43.98 percent, voted for candidate deputy Boris Ivanovich Bondarev. 133,088 voters, or 53.41 percent, voted against the candidate.

103,510 voters, or 41.54 percent, voted for candidate deputy Vasiliy Fedorovich Romashkin. 139,160 voters, or 55.85 percent, voted against the candidate.

The number of ballot papers deemed invalid was 6,505.

Since no candidate deputy received the votes of more than half the voters who took part in the voting, the okrug electoral commission submitted a proposal to the Central Electoral Commission for repeat elections to be held for the electoral okrug in question.

Leningradskiy Okrug No 14

There were 379,906 people on the list of voters, of whom 311,814, or 82.08 percent of the okrug's total number of voters, took part in the voting.

75,756 voters, or 24.3 percent, voted for candidate deputy Yuriy Yevgenyevich Veltishchev. 228,499 voters, or 73.28 percent, voted against the candidate.

60,372 voters, or 19.36 percent, voted for candidate deputy Nikolay Vasilyevich Mikhaylov. 243,883 voters, or 78.21 percent, voted against the candidate.

145,083 voters, or 46.53 percent, voted for candidate deputy Yuriy Alekseyevich Ryzhkov. 159,172 voters, or 51.05 percent, voted against the candidate.

The number of ballot papers deemed invalid was 7,559.

Since no candidate deputy received the votes of more than half the voters who took part in the voting, the okrug electoral commission decided to hold a runoff on 9 April 1989 between the two candidate deputies: Yuriy Yevgenyevich Veltishchev and Yuriy Alekseyevich Ryzhkov, who received the largest number of votes.

Lyublinskiy Okrug No 15

There were 244,007 people on the list of voters, of whom 199,519, or 81.77 percent of the okrug's total number of voters, took part in the voting.

49,526 voters, or 24.82 percent, voted for candidate deputy Nina Mikhaylovna Ageyeva. 146,457 voters, or 73.41 percent, voted against the candidate.

84,701 voters, or 42.45 percent, voted for candidate deputy Valeriy Timofeyevich Saykin. 111,282 voters, or 55.78 percent, voted against the candidate.

The number of ballot papers deemed invalid was 3,536.

Since no candidate deputy received the votes of more than half the voters who took part in the voting, the okrug electoral commission submitted a proposal to the Central Electoral Commission for repeat elections to be held for the electoral okrug in question.

Medvedkovskiy Okrug No 16

There were 235,334 people on the list of voters, of whom 184,557, or 78.42 percent of the okrug's total number of voters, took part in the voting.

45,604 voters, or 24.71 percent, voted for candidate deputy Natalya Yevseyevna Kuklina. 134,363 voters, or 72.80 percent, voted against the candidate.

102,574 voters, or 55.58 percent, voted for candidate deputy Anatoliy Vasilyevich Firsov. 77,393 voters, or 41.93 percent, voted against the candidate.

The number of ballot papers deemed invalid was 4,590.

On the basis of the results of the vote, Comrade Anatoliy Vasilyevich Firsov, senior coach at the "Kirovets" Experimental Youth Association, CPSU member, who lives in Kirovskiy Rayon, Moscow, was elected USSR people's deputy, having received the votes of more than half the voters who took part in the voting.

Oktyabrskiy Okrug No 17

There were 255,155 people on the list of voters, of whom 212,484, or 83.28 percent of the okrug's total number of voters, took part in the voting.

117,436 voters, or 55.27 percent, voted for candidate deputy Ilya Yosifovich Zaslavskiy. 90,762 voters, or 42.71 percent, voted against the candidate.

81,001 voters, or 38.12 percent, voted for candidate deputy Aleksandr Nikolayevich Krutov. 127,197 voters, or 59.86 percent, voted against the candidate.

The number of ballot papers deemed invalid was 4,286.

On the basis of the results of the vote, Comrade Ilya Yosifovich Zaslavskiy, scientific worker at the A.N. Kosygin Textile Institute in Moscow, nonparty person, who lives in Oktyabrskiy Rayon, Moscow, was elected USSR people's deputy, having received the votes of more than half the voters who took part in the voting.

Pervomayskiy Okrug No 18

There were 294,040 people on the list of voters, of whom 248,521, or 84.5 percent of the okrug's total number of voters, took part in the voting.

126,100 voters, or 50.7 percent, voted for candidate deputy Nikolay Semenovich Glazkov. 116,821 voters, or 47 percent, voted against the candidate.

72,464 voters, or 29.2 percent, voted for candidate deputy Viktor Mikhaylovich Igumenov. 170,448 voters, or 68.6 percent, voted against the candidate.

The number of ballot papers deemed invalid was 5,609.

On the basis of the results of the vote, Comrade Nikolay Semenovich Glazkov, foreman-team leader at the Moscow Decorative Timepieces Plant, CPSU member, who lives in Pervomayskiy Rayon, Moscow, was elected USSR people's deputy, having received the votes of more than half the voters who took part in the voting.

Perovskiy Okrug No 19

There were 222,434 people on the list of voters, of whom 191,049, or 85.89 percent of the okrug's total number of voters, took part in the voting.

25,782 voters, or 13.49 percent, voted for candidate deputy Valeriy Petrovich Zhukov. 159,973 voters, or 83.73 percent, voted against the candidate.

63,902 voters, or 33.45 percent, voted for candidate deputy Nelson Nikolayevich Popkov. 121,853 voters, or 63.78 percent, voted against the candidate.

84,437 voters, or 44.2 percent, voted for candidate deputy Andrey Yevgenyevich Sebentsov. 101,318 voters, or 53.03 percent, voted against the candidate.

The number of ballot papers deemed invalid was 5,294.

Since no candidate deputy received the votes of more than half the voters who took part in the voting, the okrug electoral commission decided to hold a runoff on 9 April 1989 between the two candidate deputies: Nelson Nikolayevich Popkov and Andrey Yevgenyevich Sebentsov, who received the largest number of votes.

Proletarskiy Okrug No 20

There were 299,670 people on the list of voters, of whom 249,069, or 83.11 percent of the okrug's total number of voters, took part in the voting.

83,469 voters, or 33.5 percent, voted for candidate deputy Valeriy Borisovich Nosov. 158,734 voters, or 63.73 percent, voted against the candidate.

110,524 voters, or 44.37 percent, voted for candidate deputy Aleksandr Sergeyevich Samsonov. 131,679 voters, or 52.87 percent, voted against the candidate.

The number of ballot papers deemed invalid was 6,866.

Since no candidate deputy received the votes of more than half the voters who took part in the voting, the okrug electoral commission submitted a proposal to the Central Electoral Commission for repeat elections to be held for the electoral okrug in question.

Sverdlovskiy Okrug No 21

There were 203,723 people on the list of voters, of whom 168,972, or 82.94 percent of the okrug's total number of voters, took part in the voting.

29,738 voters, or 17.6 percent, voted for candidate deputy Leonid Ivanovich Kozlovskiy. 134,469 voters, or 79.58 percent, voted against the candidate.

47,217 voters, or 27.94 percent, voted for candidate deputy Yuriy Vladimirovich Skokov. 116,990 voters, or 69.24 percent, voted against the candidate.

34,623 voters, or 20.49 percent, voted for candidate deputy Petr Sergeyevich Surov. 129,584 voters, or 76.69 percent, voted against the candidate.

The number of ballot papers deemed invalid was 4,765.

Since no candidate deputy received the votes of more than half the voters who took part in the voting, the okrug electoral commission decided to hold a runoff on 9 April 1989 between the two candidate deputies: Yuriy Vladimirovich Skokov and Petr Sergeyevich Surov, who received the largest number of votes.

Sevastopolskiy Okrug No 22

There were 223,524 people on the list of voters, of whom 146,627, or 82.6 percent of the okrug's total number of voters, took part in the voting.

92,976 voters, or 50.35 percent, voted for candidate deputy Oleg Timofeyevich Bogomolov. 87,395 voters, or 47.33 percent, voted against the candidate.

37,362 voters, or 20.23 percent, voted for candidate deputy Aleksey Mikheyevich Bryachikhin. 143,009 voters, or 77.45 percent, voted against the candidate.

36,738 voters, or 19.89 percent, voted for candidate deputy Aleksandr Vladimirovich Seredenin. 143,633 voters, or 77.79 percent, voted against the candidate.

The number of ballot papers deemed invalid was 4,256.

On the basis of the results of the vote, Comrade Oleg Timofeyevich Bogomolov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics of the World Socialist System, CPSU member, who lives in Sevastopolskiy Rayon, Moscow, was elected USSR people's deputy, having received the votes of more than half the voters who took part in the voting.

Sovetskiy Okrug No 23

There were 342,415 people on the list of voters, of whom 282,819, or 82.6 percent of the okrug's total number of voters, took part in the voting.

196,178 voters, or 69.37 percent, voted for candidate deputy Mikhail Aleksandrovich Bocharov. 78,745 voters, or 27.84 percent, voted against the candidate.

29,613 voters, or 10.47 percent, voted for candidate deputy Oleg Leonidovich Kuznetsov. 245,310 voters, or 86.74 percent, voted against the candidate.

32,744 voters, or 11.58 percent, voted for candidate deputy Oleg Mitrofanovich Sazonov. 242,179 voters, or 85.63 percent, voted against the candidate.

The number of ballot papers deemed invalid was 7,896.

On the basis of the results of the vote, Comrade Mikhail Aleksandrovich Bocharov, director of the Butovo Construction Materials Combine, CPSU member, who lives in Leninskiy Rayon, Moscow Oblast, was elected USSR people's deputy, having received the votes of more than half the voters who took part in the voting.

Timiryazevskiy Okrug No 24

There were 306,458 people on the list of voters, of whom 248,991, or 81.22 percent of the okrug's total number of voters, took part in the voting.

37,514 voters, or 15.07 percent, voted for candidate deputy Mikhail Sergeyevich Mamchenkov. 204,250 voters, or 82.06 percent, voted against the candidate.

134,710 voters, or 54.12 percent, voted for candidate deputy Arkadiy Nikolayevich Murashev. 107,054 voters, or 43.01 percent, voted against the candidate.

25,094 voters, or 10.8 percent, voted for candidate deputy Vladimir Mikhaylovich Syrtsov. 216,670 voters, or 87.05 percent, voted against the candidate.

31,751 voters, or 12.76 percent, voted for candidate deputy Yuriy Fedorovich Yurchenko. 210,013 voters, or 84.37 percent, voted against the candidate.

The number of ballot papers deemed invalid was 7,147.

On the basis of the results of the vote, Comrade Arkadiy Nikolayevich Murashev, scientific worker at the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of High Temperatures, CPSU candidate member, who lives in Leningradskiy Rayon, Moscow, was elected USSR people's deputy, having received the votes of more than half the voters who took part in the voting.

Tushinskiy Okrug No 25

There were 323,523 people on the list of voters, of whom 280,503, or 86.7 percent of the okrug's total number of voters, took part in the voting.

6,030 voters, or 2.15 percent, voted for candidate deputy Suren Grigoryevich Arutyunov. 268,634 voters, or 95.77 percent, voted against the candidate.

243,470 voters, or 86.80 percent, voted for candidate deputy Telman Khorenovich Gdlyan. 31,194 voters, or 11.12 percent, voted against the candidate.

9,149 voters, or 3.26 percent, voted for candidate deputy Anatoliy Nikolayevich Napolnov. 265,515 voters, or 94.66 percent, voted against the candidate.

3,403 voters, or 1.21 percent, voted for candidate deputy Gennadiy Aleksandrovich Sokolovskiy. 271,261 voters, or 96.71 percent, voted against the candidate.

5,825 voters, or 2.08 percent, voted for candidate deputy Nikolay Ivanovich Cherepov. 268,839 voters, or 95.84 percent, voted against the candidate.

The number of ballot papers deemed invalid was 5,839.

On the basis of the results of the vote, Comrade Telman Khorenovich Gdlyan, senior investigator for important cases under the USSR general prosecutor, CPSU member, who lives in Kirovskiy Rayon, Moscow, was elected USSR people's deputy, having received the votes of more than half the voters who took part in the voting.

Cheremushkinskiy Okrug No 26

There were 374,710 people on the list of voters, of whom 306,034, or 81.67 percent of the okrug's total number of voters, took part in the voting.

8,482 voters, or 2.77 percent, voted for candidate deputy Igor Grigoryevich Artyukh. 290,795 voters, or 95.02 percent, voted against the candidate.

99,115 voters, or 32.39 percent, voted for candidate deputy Mikhail Yakovlevich Lemeshev. 200,162 voters, or 65.41 percent, voted against the candidate.

149,776 voters, or 48.94 percent, voted for candidate deputy Sergey Borisovich Stankevich. 149,501 voters, or 48.85 percent, voted against the candidate.

27,556 voters, or 9.0 percent, voted for candidate deputy Vladimir Petrovich Kharchenko. 271,721 voters, or 88.79 percent, voted against the candidate.

The number of ballot papers deemed invalid was 6,757.

Since no candidate deputy received the votes of more than half the voters who took part in the voting, the okrug electoral commission decided to hold a runoff on 9 April 1989 between the two candidate deputies: Mikhail Yakovlevich Lemeshev and Sergey Borisovich Stankevich, who received the largest number of votes.

Restructuring Problems, Solutions Discussed

LD3003130589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 29 Mar 89

["Restructuring: Problems and Solutions" program, presented by Lev Aleksandrovich Voznesenskiy; video shows Voznesenskiy and other discussion participants seated around a table in the studio]

[Text] [Voznesenskiy] Good day, comrades. I am holding here a document which has been published in the press. It has maybe a rather heavy but, on the other hand, a fairly precise title. It is called: "The draft general principles for restructuring management of the economy and the social sphere in the union republics on the basis of a broadening of their sovereign rights, self-government and self-financing." A decision of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has submitted them for nationwide discussion. We want to invite you today to join actively in this process by means of television and telephones. [video: caption gives telephone number to call: 217-45-13]

This topic is so complex and important for the progress of economic reform and even for restructuring as a whole, not only in the sphere of the economy but also in the political and social spheres, and today we have such an abnormally large number of participants in our program that to save time I will immediately introduce them. [video shows each participant in close-up on being named]

They are: Yuriy Dmitriyevich Maslyukov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and chairman of our country's State Planning Committee;

Kalyk Abdullayev, deputy chairman of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Council of Ministers and chairman of the republic's State Planning Committee;

Vytautas Aleksandrovich Sarka, deputy chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the republic's State Planning Committee;

Vladislav Georgiyevich Kutyrkin, deputy chairman of the Moldavian SSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the republic's State Planning Committee;

Boris Ivanovich Gostev, USSR minister of finance;

Ragim Aliyevich Guseynov, deputy chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the republic's State Planning Committee;

Buri Bachabekovich Karimov, deputy chairman of the Tajik SSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the republic's State Planning Committee;

Vladimir Viktorovich Laptev, an academician and head of the economic law sector of the Institute of State Law of the USSR Academy of Sciences;

Vitold Pavlovich Fokin, deputy chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the republic's State Planning Committee;

Alikhan Rakhmatovich Atadzhanov, first deputy chairman of the Uzbek SSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the republic's State Planning Committee;

Georgiy Petrovich Badey, deputy chairman of the Belorussian SSR State Planning Committee;

Stepan Aramaisovich Sitaryan, first deputy chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee and an academician;

Yanis Martynovich Aboltyn, deputy chairman of the Latvian SSR State Planning Committee;

Sopubek Begaliyev, deputy chairman of the Kirghiz Council of Ministers and chairman of the republic's State Planning Committee;

Mkrtych Tsolakovich Mkrtchyan, deputy chairman of the Armenian SSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the republic's state planning committee;

Nikolay Ivanovich Maslennikov, deputy chairman of the Russian Federation Council of Ministers and chairman of the republic's State Planning Committee;

Vladimir Yefremovich Abramov, deputy chairman of the Turkmen SSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the republic's State Planning Committee;

Rein Augustovich Otsason, deputy chairman of the Estonian SSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the republic's State Planning Committee;

Omar Georgiyevich Vardzelashvili, deputy chairman of the Georgian SSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the republic's State Planning Committee;

and Aleksandr Ivanovich Smirnov, head of the territorial development of the national economy and capital construction department of the administration of affairs of the USSR Council of Ministers.

All the comrades present are united by the fact that they have been actively involved in the preparation of the document, which, for the sake of brevity, I am proposing to call the general principles. In this respect Yuriy Dmitriyevich is the chairman of the commission set up by the USSR Council of Ministers to prepare the draft, Stepan Aramaisovich is a leader of a working group, and virtually all the other comrades are also members of the commission and authors of the principles.

And so, Yuriy Dmitriyevich, what brought about the need for this document to appear?

[Maslyukov] In the radical economic reform now being carried out, two state laws define the set-up for the activities of enterprises, organizations, collective farms [kolkhozes] and state farms [sovkhozes]. First, there is the law on state enterprises, and second, the law on cooperatives. These laws lay down the main principles for self-management and self-financing within the framework of financial autonomy, the main link. At the same time, all enterprises function on the territories of the republic. However, such rights presently are absent to a considerable degree in the activities of the republics and are substantially restricted by the center. The press very often refers to this as the diktat of ministries and departments. The imbalance in rights that has developed initiated the elaboration in the republics of proposals for the improvement of their government and transfer to self-financing and self-government. At the same time, our economy comprises a very complicated interweaving of economic links. There was, therefore, a requirement for general principles for all the union republics in order to ensure a broadening of their economic independence and at the same time the normal functioning of the center. Incidentally, this arises from the decisions of the 19th party conference.

What, then, are the aims of the document being discussed today? The first is to find a correlation between the rights and functions of the center and the republics, whereby the center, having concentrated in itself the running of basic industries, would ensure the proportional development of the whole country, while the strong republics, mutually enriching each other, would receive sufficient rights to manage primarily those branches of the national economy that work directly for the consumer and the inhabitants of the republic. This applies, above all, to the development and running of such sectors as agriculture, the light and food industries, consumer goods production, trade, and issues relating to ecology, protection of the environment, and similar matters.

The second point is the means by which the proposed general principles expect to achieve these aims. The first is to demarcate precisely the functions and objects of management and also the powers of the center and the union republics in the ordering of the property belonging to the entire people. The second is the radical reconstruction of the procedure for drawing up budgets. The incomes of republics have been given paramount importance. The third is to restructure the organization of management and the technology of planning both the all-union and the republican economies.

The third point I would like to note is the fact that a frequent cause of dissatisfaction is that the authors of the documents being drawn up are unknown and are not presented to the public at large. Today the case is reversed. The work has been carried out mainly by our team here, in which all the chairmen of the state planning committees of the union republics are represented and in which science and the council of ministers are represented. Unfortunately, for technical reasons it is not possible to represent two departments of the USSR Academy of Sciences, so they are not present here. This means that it includes members of the councils of ministers of the union republics and members of the USSR Council of Ministers. I would like to say that the work proceeded amid sharp debate. The starting point for our commission's work was the proposals of the republics, and let me say that these proposals sometimes were diametrically opposed. However, I want to say that as a result of this work, general principles agreed to by all the participants were obtained.

A final point is that together with the fact that the principles themselves require further discussion, as certain provisions of these principles are not uncontroversial—as is demonstrated by the reaction that has appeared in the press already—we attach very great importance to today's program and regard it as one of the stages in the nationwide discussion of this document.

[Voznesenskiy] Well, we now have begun to receive, so to speak, what one might call fresh questions. One of the first belongs to Aleksandr Sergeyevich Ivanov, a senior scientific staff member. Why do the basic guidelines—well, I assume this is what Aleksandr Sergeyevich has called our General Principles—not provide for the participation of the republics as equal partners in the working out of the concept and of these basic guidelines—as he puts it—and why do provisions exist only for the participation of the union republics in the elaboration of the initial data? Why is there only provision for their participation and not an equal, joint elaboration of the initial data? I think that to a considerable extent Yuriy Dmitriyevich's answer and his account is an answer to this perplexity. Are there any objections among any of the representatives of the Union republics present, who would say that their participation had not been equal and energetic?

[Various unidentifiable voices] No.

[Voznesenskiy] No. Well, then, I think we have answered Aleksandr Sergeyvich and other comrades.

Why is the following heard in Estonia, at all levels of the leadership, on the radio and television and in the press: Strong republics and a strong center? Surely a strong center and a strong republic are alternatives? Please explain. The question is for the representatives of our republic. Well, the representatives of our republic—incidentally, the question was put by Lyudmila Sergeyevna Tselikova, an engineer for Tallinn—and so the question is for you. [turns to Otsason] Carry on, please.

[Otsason] Well, I arrived from Tallinn only today, and I cannot say that I have heard such attempts to set things against each other very often, but I would in fact put this question a little differently. It seems to me that the concept of the center is not very precise. By center one could understand our Soviet Union as a whole and its leading bodies, or one could understand the ministries and departments and the diktat we are discussing today. So perhaps it would be more correct to put it as a strong union and strong republics.

[Voznesenskiy] Does anyone want to add anything to that way of putting it?

[Mkrtchyan] In general principle, this is an important link in the implementation of the economic reform, and it is directed toward resolving a dual task—strengthening the center and the local managing bodies. Thus are created the necessary prerequisites for rapid and effective development of every union republic, with a simultaneous strengthening of the unified national-economic complex of the country. Apparent in this are the advantages of division of labor and specialization across the union, and in this lies the essence of the unified national-economic complex of the country and of fraternal mutual assistance of our peoples. The significance of this mutual assistance cannot be overestimated. This has been quite obviously apparent because of the natural disaster that struck Armenia. The earthquake, of unprecedented force, bore away many thousands of human lives and inflicted heavy damage on the republic's national economy. Under these conditions, without the immense aid rendered to Armenia by all the fraternal republics, without the large-scale measures and prompt decisions adopted by the Central Committee of our party, by the Government of the country, and by the commission of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, one could not have even contemplated the restoration of the immense damage inflicted on our republic, to say nothing of self-financing and regional financial autonomy. I would like to take advantage of this opportunity to express to the television audience of the entire country our immense gratitude to all union republics, enterprises and organizations, and also to the many countries of the world which are carrying out restoration work in our republic, and to every person who stood by us at a difficult time. Indeed, we are strong when we are together.

[Voznesenskiy] Comrade Kokabadze, from Tbilisi, has just phoned in to ask this question: Do you not consider it a violation of the Constitution that you are talking about an expansion of rights and not about the full sovereignty of the republics? Vladimir Viktorovich, your opinion; briefly, of course.

[Laptev] I do not think there is any violation here. The fact is that we live in a federative socialist state, and the republics go to make up this state as sovereign ones. At the same time, however, there is the sovereignty of the Soviet Union as a whole. The relationship between these two sovereignties is defined by the Constitution of the Soviet Union. It has to be taken into account that there exist different concepts for all kinds of complex states. There is confederation, in which states do, indeed, preserve their independence in full. And there is federation, under which the participating states pass certain of their rights to the center, or union, as has been said here, that is, to our state as a whole. So I think the delineation of rights between the center and the union republics that has come into being has proved incorrect now; the rights of the union republics are too narrow and small; and the expansion of these republics' rights through the transfer of part of the functions that have been and still are implemented here by the center means precisely an expansion of rights. So I think such a term is perfectly justified and correct.

[Voznesenskiy] Yuriy Pavlovich Yermakov has just addressed the following question, I would even say reproach, to me: Your broadcasts are very important and interesting for our people—thank you, Yuriy Pavlovich—but why do you not invite Politburo members and CPSU Central Committee secretaries to take part in them? After all, Comrade Gerasimov invites them to briefings for foreign correspondents. We always see only the active work of comrades Gorbachev and Ryzhkov, but we see the others mainly behind the Presidium table and at airports. To begin with, I will say then that Yuriy Dmitriyevich Maslyukov is a candidate member of the Politburo, and we hope that with his presence and participation in today's program Yuriy Dmitriyevich will make a start on the good tradition that Yuriy Pavlovich Yermankov champions. Second, Yuriy Pavlovich evidently does not always watch our "Meet the Press" programs, in which the most responsible of our leaders take part. There, too, we have had repeated participation by candidate members of the Politburo. Nevertheless, under the conditions of glasnost and its expansion, of democratization of the life of our society, this form of glasnost and democratization naturally will be expanding and intensifying.

Yuriy Nikitovich Medvedev, a secondary school teacher, asks: If all the republics, or even oblasts, Armenia, North Causcasus, Crimea, Ivanovo, and so on, start protesting against the construction on their territory of atomic, thermal, and even hydroelectric power stations, how will the country solve its energy problems? This also applies to metallurgical, chemical, pulp and paper, and other production lines. Perhaps you will reply? [turns to Abdullayev]

[Abdullayev] Lev Aleksansdrovich, indeed we have of late been coming across cases both in our republic and in other regions in the country where construction of one or another vitally important project is rejected. In my view, there are a number of reasons for this. The first reason is unsatisfactory projects from a purely ecological point of view. Another point is poor execution of these poor projects. In my view, in principle, today a very profound and thorough interpretation is being made of how we should further develop both the location of productive forces and the location of these production lines. First of all we have to get away from diktat by union ministries and departments; that is, we have to go on from diktat by union ministries and departments to harmonized work of local soviets and councils of ministers; that is, not make the problem one of setting one thing against another, but finding mutually acceptable and correct decisions. We all have to remember that it is the development of these production lines that is the foundation of our economy, and for that reason it is expounded in the general principles that the role of local soviets and councils of ministers will be enhanced in future, and that means expert studies and extradepartmental studies.

The main thing, comrades, is that we must always strive by joint efforts for these projects to be not too harmful ecologically, and at the same time we all have to remember that without power engineering, without our industries, without their development, we will be unable to move the economy of our country onward. That would be my reply.

[Voznesenskiy] I will just give you another question to study; here it is. Go on, please, Nikolay Ivanovich.

[Maslennikov] I would just like to draw attention to one circumstance. At present, they have now started in all oblasts, krays, and autonomous republics, and I think in the Ukraine, Belorussia, and everywhere, to work out schemes to develop the location of productive forces for every oblast for a 15-year period. The oblast soviet executive committees, kray executive committees, and so on, the councils of ministers of autonomous republics, presently have requests from union and republican ministries to examine, and then we will put proposals to the USSR State Planning Committee so that our interests can be taken into consideration.

[Begaliyev] May I add something?

[Voznesenskiy] Please.

[Begaliyev] I don't think there will be any objections from the republics. On the contrary, we are working on proposals for making maximum use of natural resources and opportunities. To be more specific, in the Kirghiz SSR, given our water resources and the mountain rivers in our republic, we have worked out [word indistinct] major measures: the construction of a number of cascade power stations, in particular. By the year 2005 we plan to build 18 hydro stations, which will dramatically increase the utilization of the water and provide us with the required electricity resources. Most of this construction is to be done in mountain areas; no harm will be done to agricultural interests, and it will produce economic and ecological benefits. We have submitted this proposal for consideration by the union government and the CPSU Central Committee.

[Voznesenskiy] Well, my friends, it's nice to see that things are getting going so well. Let's take you one at a time.

[Vardzelashvili] I would say that this is a more complex problem, this issue of [word indistinct]. You're hardly likely to find any country, republic, or region where the public wouldn't speak out against disruption of the ecological balance, and therefore against the construction of atomic or hydropower stations. Clearly all of us, all the republics and the scientists, have to determine correctly the parameters of utilization of natural resources, and, as Comrade Kalyk said earlier, we have to refine the plans and inform public opinion that rational use of resources is indispensible to us. It would be nice to preserve everything in its original state, but we have to make rational use of nature. Plus....

[Voznesenskiy, interrupting, to Atadzhanov] Yes, go ahead.

[Atadzhanov] This issue is one of great significance and value for Uzbekistan in particular, since in the 13th 5-year period we plan to develop a whole range of new industries, heavily science-based industries and industrial products in our region. Various ministries and departments want to build over 300 enterprises during the 13th 5-year period, and given the shortage of land—the shortage of irrigated land—the siting of these enterprises really is a very great problem for our republic. Our oblasts, in conjunction with our government and state planning committee, are now taking a rational approach to the selection of sites, and in particular to the problem of ecological protection in the sites we are selecting. There is some lack of understanding in certain organizations by individual comrades, but they underestimate the overall economic importance for that region. I think that when working with each official specifically, or else in each specific enterprise or oblast, we have to solve this matter fully.

[Voznesenskiy, to Kutyrkin] Yes, go ahead.

[Kutyrkin] I believe there's one thing we shouldn't forget here. When we talk about developing the productive forces of a region, the most important thing is predetermined in the document: that is, the financial prosperity of each region will depend directly both on the level of development of the productive forces and on the efficiency with which the existing production potential is exploited. This is a factor of some importance for stimulating the development of production and for the siting of enterprises.

[Voznesenskiy, to Aboltyn] Yes, on you go.

[Aboltyn] I agree with what was said about the quality of the plans—they are all at the state level—but I think it's also very important for the republic itself to make a clear-cut choice of what it can do most productively. For instance, we have the problem of Yurmala: What's more important, a national holiday resort or, let's say, making cellulose? If we're given the right in this interrepublican exchange to decide what we could most beneficially exchange for something else, this problem would become considerably less acute and, I believe, would be resolved better.

[Voznesenskiy] Comrades, we keep getting questions on the way we're conducting the program, and I think I ought to read them out. For instance, Ikramov, a student from Tajikistan, asks why the speakers—he mentions two of those who have already spoken—are replying to previously prepared questions and what, therefore, is the point of having a live broadcast? I would explain to Comrade Ikranov that if he had paid a bit more attention to our features on radio and television and in GOVORIT I POKAZYVAYET MOSKVA he would probably not be asking that question. In order to give viewers in precisely such remote parts of the country the chance of taking a greater part in the program, we announced via those channels that we were setting up a editorial telephone line during the 2 days preceeding the program to receive questions. People telephoned in, and some of the questions were very meaty. As you can see, there weren't many really meaty questions. We picked them out for the program and, naturally, put them to the participants. But, as you can see as the program proceeds, most of what we are discussing is based on the questions that are coming into the studio on our 20 lines at the moment.

Comrade Sergey Nikolayevich Parkhomenko from Kiev points out that the second point of the basic guidelines—well, actually they're called basic principles, but he's not the first to call them basic guidelines through sheer force of habit—states that the diktat of the state ministries is to be replaced by the diktat of republican and local bodies. How can you replace one diktat with another and at the same time achieve economic restructuring? Aleksandr Ivanovich.

[Smirnov] There seems to be some mistake here. Everyone present here will confirm that this cannot be right. But let's take a look. We have analyzed this subject more than once, because the enterprises are the breadwinners of the cities, rayons, republics, and country, and therefore, above all, this document took into account the law on the state enterprise and the fact that the enterprise and its interests are, in this sense, inviolate. In the second point it is stated—this was a requirement we applied when drawing up the general principles—that in increasing the economic independence of individual territories there must be no prejudice to the financial autonomy rights of the main production link, the enterprise, nor must there by any replacement of the command-administration diktat of the union ministries by the diktat of reublican and local bodies.

[Voznesenskiy] A stance which is diametrically opposite to what's suggested in this question?

[Otason] Yes, of course. But it should be added that this can be achieved not only in words, but, above all, by developing economic management methods and by genuinely replacing many of the administrative methods that exist even today. This is also a big issue.

[Sitaryan] But this replacement has to occur in the work of both the central and the republican bodies. If it is accompanied only by changes in the functions and working methods of the central bodies, while the republican bodies continue to work as before, then on obtaining such enormous rights they might, of course, not always use them as one would like.

[Voznesenskiy] Stepan Aramaisovich, we've already got some specific questions on this issue, so I'm putting them your way. Maybe you could give some supplmentary replies to them.

[Laptev] We've already had questions from Comrade Chadayev and Comrade Tugerozova from Leningrad pointing out that we've recently had a situation in which ministries are violating the rights of enterprises. They are issuing masses of departmental instructions and the enterprises' economic independence is being constrained. It is precisely in reference to this point about not replacing one diktat with another that the viewers are wondering if, under the future conditions when the union bodies have been replaced by the republican bodies, the latter will still infringe upon the enterprises' rights.

I believe that this is, of course, a complex issue. There really is such a danger, and, alongside the economic methods which have been correctly mentioned here, there should be very vigorous use of legal methods as well. After all, comrades, what we are discussing here are the draft basic principles, which will subsequently be enacted in law. In that law, the draft of which is now being drawn up, we must, of course, devote particular attention to guaranteeing the rights of enterprises.

Actually, I would say that there already is something of this in these basic principles. To give just on example, it is stated that economic norms must be used and contractual relations developed in dealings between local soviets and the enterprises located on their territory. I believe this is very important for guaranteeing the rights of the enterprises and for ensurig financial autonomy in their work. It's not just that we're carrying out an economic reform at the moment; we're also carrying out a political reform. We're attempting to create a law-governed state, and a major element in a law-governed state is socialist legality and law and order in all spheres of public life, including the national economy. I believe that observing the rights of enterprises is also a very important principle in our new system, in a law-governed state system.

[Voznesenskiy] Comrades, I'm gradually handing out to you the questions arriving here in front of me, and if you see that the conversation is approaching one of the problems brought up by the questions you've been given, please join in the discussion. Yes, go ahead.

[Abramov] Comrade Ahmed Durdukov from Uzbekistan has phoned in to ask: Why is so much cotton grown in Central Asia and why are so few processing factories built there? This is a very proper and interesting question, which leads me to note that when we were drawing up the draft basic principles there was a very ardent discussion on the role and place of the republican economy in the all-union division of labor.

At the moment we regard Turkmenia and virtually all the other republics as specialists in a number of industries or in many industries. For instance, the Turkmen Republic has always specialized in the oil industry, in oil extraction, gas extraction, the gas industry, and cotton production. These specializations have always been given priority when capital investment was being allocated and in the development of capacities, and today the situation is such that there really is specialization in the republic; the republic makes a specific contribution, so to speak, to our country's overall economy. It is thus perfectly correct to raise the question of cotton processing, because, well, in our republic today all we do is the initial processing, initial cotton processing, and by virtue of our specialization we send the fiber to other parts of the country.

So our task in the basic principles, or rather in our subsequent work to work out an economic mechanism for implementing the basic principles for reorganizing the economy on the principle of republican self-management and self-financing, is to determine the real contributions made by the republics and a mechanism of equivalent exchange, given the existing republican specialization. This, of course, does not prevent the republics, and ours in particular, from doing a great deal of work on improving industrial production. That's what I wanted to....

[Badey, interrupting] I've also got a question that's approximately on the same subject.

[Voznesenskiy] Just approximately?

[Badey] Yes, well it's more or less relevant. Why is it that according to economic development indicators the Belorussian SSR is ahead of (?the other republics), while in per capita income, level of social development, and housing it lags considerably behind other republics, in particular the Baltic republics? That's a question from Comrade Koteshov in Minsk.

Well, I'd like to mention that when drawing up the basic principles we discussed the problem of assessing the contributions made by the republics to the all-union coffers, and we never did arrive at any criteria enabling us to state that one republic contributes more and another contributes less. So for the moment I'm not willing to say whether we work much better than our neighbors in the Baltic republics.

As far as the pace of industrial production is concerned, industrial development, we really are, perhaps, working a little better than them, but they have far better agricultural indicators. Obviously, we have to take into account the conditions in which we found ourselves to start with, and under which we are developing. That's the answer I would give to that question.

[Voznesenskiy, to Maslyukov] Yuriy Dmitriyevich, we have had two practically identical questions from Pavel Pavlovich Nikolayev, a construction engineer, and Vladimir Vikentiyevich Podolets: Why are the draft basic principles so wordy? After all, unlike various kinds of legal documents and industry instructions, principles ought to be just that—principles, set out briefly, clearly, and comprehensively.

[Unidentified speaker from off-screen] We kept cutting them down and cutting them down, but even so someone has complained.

[Voznesenskiy] Yes, even so, we have received a complaint, two even, at least.

[Maslyukov] Well, I would answer the question as follows: When the commission headed by Napoleon I wrote the French Civil Code—I think it was in 1804—he told them to write it briefly, clearly, and incomprehensibly. So when we were faced with that task, we had to take into account the fact that the draft would be discussed nationwide. The task was presented to us in a different way; it had to be comprehensible, comprehensible to every inhabitant, to the inhabitants of all the republics, and we had to explain the principles underlying our approaches. That is what we have tried to do. Of course, when the law is being drawn up, it will definitely be cut down; it will be made clear and comprehensible. That we promise you.

[Voznesenskiy, to Fokin] Right, over to you, Vitold Pavlovich.

[Fokin] Lev Aleksandrovich, I was a little late in joining in on the question you were discussing earlier, but I have been handed a question from a Muscovite, Gennadiy Vasiliyevich Snegorov, who writes that self-financing and self-capitalization in the regions are the causes of their unequal development, and thereby the causes of nationalism, and so on. Well, first of all, I think Gennadiy Vasiliyevich is mistaken. Self-financing and self-capitalization cannot be considered the causes of unequal development; more likely it is the other way around. Actually, it is a fairly interesting question, and although I may be getting a little ahead of events here, I would like to note that I was one of those who opposed the holding of an experiment on transfer to the new principles, to the basic principles, in individual republics. My reason was that the starting conditions vary too greatly from republic to republic. National income per capita in Turkmenia, for example, is around R970, whereas in Latvia it is R2,670. As Georgiy Petrovich correctly said, this is not, of course, because some work better and others worse; it is the result of the existing industrial structure of the economy, and you cannot change this structure overnight. Indeed, we have to consider whether it is worth changing. Anyway, given these differences, the USSR Ministry of Finance—Boris Ivanovich, there—when compiling the state budget, gives the republics a certain proportion of the turnover tax from the relevant territory, thereby somewhat evening things up. There are five republics that receive—and rightly so, I think—grants from the state budget. So I am convinced—I am nearly finished, Lev Aleksandrovich; I guess we are going to return to this question in the future—that before the transition to self-financing a mechanism of maximum precision and objectivity should be created, a mechanism for shaping the starting base. For there is no such mechanism, and under such conditions even negligible errors can really affect national interests and lead to undesirable consequences.

[Voznesenskiy] I can see that our friends wish either to add or even correct something. So if you would like to speak one at a time.

[Abramov] I simply wanted to correct Vitold Pavlovich. It is already being said for the second time on television that Turkmenia's per-capita national income is R970. Evidently, someone said so in error for the first time, yes, said so in error, and this being repeated. The per-capita national income is some R1,500. We are somewhere in the region of 10th-11th place. I found it necessary to correct this because for some reason it is not for the first time that this is being repeated.

[Voznesenskiy] Good. Rein Augustovich, over to you.

[Otsason] I would like to add that we have become accustomed, sometimes for decades, to some old ways of thinking, so that we do not understand that the unprofitability of some industries is not at all a normal phenomenon. In our correct price formation—we have the principles, what needs to be done—all industries must be profitable. There must, of course, be such a situation in which an industry specializing in something will be in a profitable or a particularly unprofitable situation.

[Voznesenskiy] My friends, I must read out a request by Aleksey Mikhaylovich Komarov. It is desirable that those answering questions should give their surname and republic. I had not wanted, so to speak, to promulgate this question because it would take too much time, to promulgate this question by Tashmukhamedov Kudrat, which reached us from Tashkent: Why does each republic not have its representative? Well, then, Comrade Tashmukhamedov, there are so many in the studio today precisely because without a single exception, the deputy chairmen of each republic's Council of Ministers, who are also chairmen of the state planning committees, are attending. Evidently, you have joined our broadcast somewhat late, so to speak, but nevertheless, if you sometimes were to say: here in the Ukraine, or here in Kirghizia, this would be an additional point of reference for our listeners.

[Karimov] Let us start in that way.

[Voznesenskiy] OK. Over to you.

[Karimov] Well, then. From Dushanbe, Samandar Iskiandar asks three questions. Sometimes one hears it said that the Tajik SSR is on state grants. What is the extent of the state grants it receives? Second question: A month ago, a meeting was organized of the chairmen of the councils of ministers and the chairmen of the state planning committees of the Central Asian republics and Kazakhstan—what was the aim of the meeting? Couldn't the Tajik SSR reduce the acreage sown to cotton in order to develop fruit growing and viticulture on the vacated areas? I will try to give a brief answer.

Indeed, the republic is allocated money from the union budget. Say, in 1987 R244 million was allocated; in 1988 R420 million. For 1989, R320 million is planned. Why has this happened?

Firstly, because the drop in the processing of grapes into wine resulted in a loss of turnover tax of R100 million. The dispatch of wine stock outside the republic yielded R120 million.

If one takes another matter—the most important for us—9 percent of cotton fiber is processed elsewhere, while, according to the most modest estimates, it has been calculated today that this would yield a turnover tax to the amount of R1.9 billion.

In the republic today we receive no allocations to the republics budget from the processing industries, from mining enterprises. The same situation obtains with chemical plants. I am saying all this not to stress an apparent injustice but merely, as the other comrades said here, to note that, indeed, to date we simply do not have a mechanism to draw up the budget. Today it will simply be necessary to speak of the need to redistribute funds and not of the republic receiving grants. As regards the meeting, indeed, last month the chairmen of the councils of ministers and the chairmen of the state planning committees of the Central Asian republics and Kazakhstan gathered to discuss the question of deepening interrepublican ties between the Central Asian republics and Kazakhstan, and also economic, social, and other questions, including the internationalist education of young people, and so forth. Couldn't the Tajik SSR reduce the acreage sown to cotton? It can. The government of the republic has issued a letter to this effect that permission has been given to stop at the level of 800,000 tonnes of cotton by the year 1992.

[Voznesenskiy] Comrades, we will now have to give Nikolay Ivanovich Maslenikov the opportunity to put forward his point of view—to say a few words on a very serious problem, which has a direct bearing on what you and other comrades have said.

I have here in my hands the questions of Engineer Vladimir Vasilyevich Mikhaylenko from Gorkiy: Why is it that, according to the draft, only 27 percent of output produced, as he writes, remains at the RSFSR'S disposal, whereas more than 70 percent remains at the disposal of other republics, for instance the Baltic republics and Central Asia? Questions close to this are asked by Pavel Yevseyevich Budnitskiy, senior scientific staff member, and Velentin Ivanovich Sokolov from Pskov has just called. And there is a multitude of similar questions that I have relayed to you. Over to you.

[Maslennikov] I even wish to say that Pavel Yevseyevich Budnitskiy, senior scientific staff member from Moscow, is putting the question even more sharply. This is what he says: this will lead to the RSFSR being left a raw material appendage of the other republics, all those present here, and this is unjust toward the major republic of our union.

I would like to note that such profound questions are evidence that in our republic the general principles are being absorbed analytically. A number of aspects require an explanation, including the aspects we are now discussing.

The document which you and I are discussing here today provides for the realization of measures to broaden the sphere of the management of the union republics. In order to strengthen the material base of the economy of all union republics it is proposed to place under the management of the councils of ministers of all republics seated here the enterprises of the agro-industrial complex, the food industries—I have in mind in the first place the food sectors of industry, at the present time the USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee; enterprises of the light industry, at the moment the USSR Light Industry Ministry; enterprises of the construction and the construction materials industry, which was the USSR Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry; and so forth.

Here, it seems to me that all republics are equal: They receive under their jurisdiction and supervision everything which now comes under the union-republican ministries. This is also shown by the numerical indices which are cited in the document—namely, the relative significance of the output of industrial enterprises which, after the law is passed, will be under the mangement of the union republics, and will increase considerably in the total volume of industrial production in the republic in question. Well, in particular, in the USSR from 5 to 36 percent—seven times; in the RSFSR from 4 to 27 percent—almost sevenfold; in the Ukraine eight times; in Belorussia seven times; in the Trans-Caucasus seven and eight times; in the Baltic republics eightfold; that is to say, with these figures I want to show that virtually all figures are identical, (?Yuriy Dmitriyevich). That is to say, the increase in all republics is seven to eight times, of the same order.

But there is a second aspect to the question which concerns the distinctive features of the Russian Federation. Our republic is the main supplier of fuel and raw materials for all union republics, and also—let me draw your attention to this—supplies for export as well. Apart from these industries, the RSFSR also has large volumes of industrial output of machine building. This is one-third of the entire volume of our RSFSR industry: these are turbines, machine tools, sedans, tractors, etc., etc. So, it seems to me that it is wrong to speak of the RSFSR as a raw materials appendage.

[Unidentified speaker from off-screen] By the way, the RSFSR is also a major consumer, Nikolay Ivanovich.

[Maslennikov] A major consumer, of course. But I would also like to draw [your attention] to a third aspect of this question. It seems to me that our viewers should have a good understanding of this. The draft general principles propose a substantial increase in the payments from the profits of the enterprises and organizations under union jurisdiction into the revenues, Boris Ivanovich, of the union republics.

[Gostev] Forty percent.

[Maslennikov] I think that this requires our wide support, with it being given in accordance with a single norm. Moreover, something you probably have not paid attention to: the fact that a foreign currency fund will be established. All enterprises, irrespective of the departments they come under, will assign their share to this republican foreign currency fund, to this republican foreign fund. I think that the question is clear here.

[Voznesenskiy] Okay then. Over to Yanis Martynovich. Next, friends, next.

[Aboltyn] Well, then, here I also have a question from Riga. August (?Toziis) asks: What sort of financial autonomy is this if 87 percent of industry comes under union jurisdiction? But I wish to confirm that from 13 percent it will rise to 60 [percent]. I touch in two words on this concern among the public regarding interrepublican, say, supplies. Obviously, in our republic, in Latvia, the opinion is appearing that we must also change over to a fundamentally new document. As it were, a treaty between the republic and the union must appear regarding what we receive for the republic and what we export from the republic, including among other things also financial relations.

[Voznesenskiy] Stepan Aramaisovich, over to you. Boris Ivanovich, I will (?also) come around to you.

[Sitaryan] Yes, the question of why there is a different proportion is very important, and taking such a superficial approach one can observe a certain injustice, as has been stated on this question. I would like to literally—if I can put it like this—reveal the technology or the anatomy of these figures.

First, all republics are equal on these principles in the running of those spheres which are being transferred to the union republics. There is no clause in these principles whereby some republics would run spheres in a wider zone than, say, other republics.

Then the question arises: Why are there such discrepancies in figures? The discrepancies in figures are determined by the group structure of the republics. Behind this figure lies the proportion of those groups and industries, the running of which, as follows from the basic principles, will be implemented by the center, in other words, the fuel and energy industries, the metallurgical industry, and the defense industries. Historically and in connection with the distribution of productive forces, matters have developed to a state whereby they have been to a greater extent concentrated in both scale and proportion in the RSFSR, the Ukraine, and Belorussia, and, to a lesser extent, in the other republics and, incidentally, in Kazakhstan. Therefore, in no way can one perceive inequality behind these figures. [passage indistinct, as two people speak at once]

[Voznesenskiy] One moment, one moment, well, Aleksandr Ivanovich, please.

[Smirnov] It's just that—the way the question was put, and the way it was delivered, and the fact that (?it was passed on) to Nikolay Ivanovich Maslennikov—one gets the feeling, comrades, that someone just sat down and started to share out branches of the national economy between individual republics and the union. It seems to me that Stepan Aramaisovich showed convincingly that this is the result, this is the productive realization of the general principles—the question of what can be more advantageously, expeditiously and effectively left at union level, and what can be transferred to the function of management by the union republics. The union should first and foremost ensure the economic independence of the country and create the conditions for a dynamic and harmonious development of the economy. The union republics are directly closer to natural resources and to meeting the requirements of the population. That's how we get the distribution of industries. So, the figures themselves are the productive realization of common approaches and not a case of one republic needing to provide more and another less. That's not how we operated, and it simply couldn't be that way.

[Voznesenskiy] Georgiy Petrovich.

[Badey] I would single out in this problem today not so much the proportion of industry which remains subordinate to the republics; it seems to me that what is more important today is the problem of how to build mutual relations between the republics and enterprises which are subordinate to the union, union ministries, and departments. I have to say that this question was very acute when the general principles were being worked out, but obviously we found a compromise only thanks to the wise leadership of our leaders and our working gorup—I would put it directly like that. Yes. In the general principles we envisaged, first, that the union republics would participate in examining the starting figures for planning consumer goods and paid services, and the republics would have priority rights in allocating orders above a state order. These are the things which, obviously, we must today recognize as positive. Nevertheless, there are still other questions, and I believe that we will have to continue working in order to improve these mutual relations.

[Voznesenskiy] Alikan Rakhmatovich, show us an example (?briefly), but add something to it.

[Atadzhanov] The question of the participation of union enterprises situated on the territory of a republic and the republican budget is indeed—for our republic, for example—a very important one. Something like 32 percent of the overall industrial output produced in the republic is produced by enterprises in our Republic of Uzbekistan which are subordinate to the union. But in the production of consumer goods for our population living in Uzbekistan, these enterprises produce only 8-9 percent of the volume of consumer goods. This is a minimum participation on their part. A question which is particularly important to our republic is that of the contributions by union enterprises situated on our territory to the republican budget. In the general principles a set contribution of 40 percent is envisaged, but for such republics as Uzbekistan and Central Asian republics it may be reviewed in favor of its being increased. But when we go through it, probably with the State Planning Committee [Gosplan], the Finance Ministry, and other ministries and departments, this will be specified. [passage indistinct. as several people talk at once]

[Vosnesenskiy] My friends, by this exchange of rejoinders we have demonstrated to our viewers, albeit unwillingly, how complex your work is, how much points of view differ, and how difficult it is to find a common bond, but let us show that at the end of the day it is possible to find this common bond. May the common bond in this program be the brevity of your answers, and please speak only in essential terms about the problem we are discussing at the moment. Boris Ivanovich, up to now our whole powerful empire of finance has been in the shade! [chuckles] A question for you, Boris Ivanovich, from Ilya Matveyevich Dobrinskiy, a teacher: How, under conditions of self-financing, will the union budget be shaped, and to what purpose will it be spent—just on defense, or on various building sites of the century, as well?

[Gostev] Well, I would like, first of all, to talk about (?how things are with the economy). In my opinion, not bad. The more so because the document is entitled Self-Management and Self-Financing. In the very headline it speaks about enhancing the role of finances and provides for a considerable increase in the role of finances and the budget in shaping the incomes of the republics. This is an integrable part—as they sometimes call it in short—of the financial autonomy of territories or regions.

If we are talking about the question put by Ilya Matveyevich Dobrinskiy, he really expresses the essence of the question. Changing the shape of the budget is indeed what is in mind. If we speak in general terms, then today the basic principle will be set out this way: A republic having at its disposal units of administration [obyekty upravleniya] will obtain from them revenue for its own republican budget. In other words, what is meant is handing agriculture and industries serving the population directly over to the control of republics, and having the revenue go from there directly in to the republican budget. True, the reverse mechanism is also intended, whereby each enterprise takes part in shaping the state budget. Part of the revenue from republican industry will be released to the union budget. That seems to me to be a very important principle, that really creates a financial basis for the development of the union republic economies.

In general, the (?pulse) or dispute, so to speak, seemingly became: Give us more, or less. I think one should orient oneself on a common standard, and it is necessary to earn resources. One should only spend the amount of resources earned in the republic. This does not exclude assistance to republics from the union budget, and one probably should not fear the occasional words: We are affording assistance from the union budget. For example, when Kazakhstan was developing, all the union republics and the entire union assisted in its development. That was correct. Today disaster has come to Armenia, and all the republics and the union budget are helping Armenia. That will cost us R10 or R12 billion. Armenia by itself never would have resolved this problem, but in principle, one must reckon on one's own resources and build one's economy based on this.

Answering Comrade Dobrynskiy, I would say—very briefly, of course, because the elaboration of the budget is a complex process—first, that the union budget will receive profit and deductions from profit from union industry, and a part from republican industry. There will be a tax on turnover, with the exception of the part attributed to the republics, and on incomes from foreign economic activity. These are the sources from which the union budget is to be formed. As for the expenditures from the union budget, they will be directed, first and foremost, to the implementation of general state socio-economic, scientific-technical, and ecological programs, to the fulfilment of goal-oriented programs for the evening-out of the economic and social development of individual union republics and regions for as long as this economic inequality remains, and third, for the financing of fundamental research. We need to develop fundamental science; this is a concern for the union budget. Money will be spent on the development of the key industries: heavy industry, and particularly such industries as heavy industry power engineering. What republic can take upon itself the construction, say, of major hydroschemes? This will be done from the union budget. Money also will be spent on strengthening the country's defense capability and the maintenance of the union bodies of state power. Lev Aleksandrovich, I have received many other questions, too, which concern to some degree or other the sphere of finances.

Comrade Yevgeniya Petrovna Butyrina asks: Can one say how much of the union republic resources are invested in the union fund and how much is transferred to the republics, beginning with 1946? Well, I naturally do not and cannot remember such figures. I can say just one thing: We have a single state budget, and hence flows of money are possible both from the union to the union republics and from the union republics for the consolidation of the union budget.

With the transfer to financial autonomy of territories, as we say, there will be no point where a territory will close itself off into its own income and live that way. That would not be right and, as Comrade Laptev has said, would not be in line with the federative, the federal arrangement of our state. I could cite figures but I don't want to burden the comrades with figures. I can just say that the payments of Union enterprises, those of Union subordination, to the republics will increase considerably. While today the Union republics have been receiving R4 billion from enterprises with Union subordination, they will be receiving R30 billion. That does not mean that their budget will increase by that sum; other items will be revised accordingly; and, in particular, the deductions for tax on turnover which has been and is going to the benefit of the Union republics will be reduced. [Voznesenskiy is shown trying to interrupt for another question] I still have more to reply to. There are very acute questions here.

[Voznesenskiy] You want to use up all your allocation at one go! (?Carry on.)

[Gostev] Well, not all my allocation, probably, but I would like to say that there are a lot of questions here that have come in for me. I just did not want to be accused of not replying to questions. For some reason there are questions here about the Ministry of Water Conservancy. Very angry questions about money being thrown away, people being made liable, scrapping it, and so forth. Well, to begin with, I must tell you that in accordance with the decision of the March plenum, the Ministry of Water Conservance has been reorganized as the Ministry of Construction of Water Conservancy Systems [ministerstvo stroitelstva vodokhozyaystvennykh sistem]; that has already been done, I can tell the comrades that, if they had not noticed.

Second, we should probably not become heated. There is another question here. Perhaps sometimes the comrades do not understand it properly; maybe it is expressed very sharply in the press; but we do need construction of land improvement projects. That will be confirmed by the Gosplan chairman, and Central Asia and Ukraine will say so. We have to resolve major problems of supplying vegetables to the population, and that can only be done on improved land. It is another matter that while creating this improved land in good quantities, we neglect the old farms. The Union republics, in transferring to financial autonomy, ought to devote more attention to this, invest funds in what has been created, and not just engage in new construction.

I would not raise the question that way, Lev Aleksandrovich; it just seemed to me that these questions must be answered so that we cannot be told that we (?buried) something.

[Voznesenskiy] Well, thanks to this you have replied to the question from Yuriy Nikolayevich Ilyashenko from Stavropol, a question that came to me just as you were talking about it.

[Gostev] Of course, there are other questions [words indistinct], I think that there will be specific questions in the sphere of finances, and we will definitely give a reply to the comrades that have addressed them.

[Maslennikov] Boris Ivanovich has not mentioned one important circumstance, it seems to me. Now, according to this document, in budget planning all enterprises, regardless of their departmental subordination, will contribute so-called resources payments to republican and local budgets, for water, for land, for labor resources. In general that is a good decision.

[Gostev] There will probably be a thrifty attitude toward land, water, and so forth.

[Voznesenskiy] We have a question in connection with this, too—maybe it comes close to this—from Aleksandr Nikolayevich Nikonov from Volokhov, a candidate of technical sciences. It is just a little different, but it is also connected with water usage: Deductions of payments for water to the budget of union republics will encourage the increased extraction of water to the detriment of neighboring republics and the ecology. How is it planned to organize the management of water conservancy on inter-republican rivers to avoid this? Maybe we could have a very brief reply to this. Carry on, please.

[Atadzhanov] In my view there are no reasons to put it that way. Regardless of whether deductions of payments will be made, water extraction by the kolkhozes and sovkhozes in a republic is carried out on the basis of water utilization limits worked out and confirmed by the Ministry of Water Conservancy. For example, supervision of interrepublican rivers in Central Asia: Specialist associations have been formed for the rivers Amudarya and Syrdarya, and these are directly subordinate to the Union. They maintain control over water distribution among the Central Asian republics and the south of Kazakhstan. So, to my mind, there is no reason to believe that this might have a comeback from increases in contributions to the budget, as he puts it in the question.

[Voznesenskiy] Good.

[Gostev] Lev Aleksandrovich, may I add that the one paying into the budget for water is not the territory, but a specific financially autonomous enterprise, kolkhoz, or sovkhoz [words indistinct] an interest in reducing water usage.

[Voznesenskiy, over several voices at once] Regardless of whose territory it is located on. Let us move on from water, but not quite to the theme that concerns you. We are about to come to your replies.

Sergey Viktorovich Trofimov, a builder, asks: Why is there no word in the broadcast about what changes there will be in the rights in the economic activities precisely of the republics of which union republics are comprised—Abkhazia, for example? Omar Georgiyevich, please. [words indistinct] to make it easier to comment on the question.

[Vardzelashvili] In the general principles, yes. In the general principles, it is pointed out that the rights and obligations of local soviets continue to be determined (?by) the union republic when the principles of self-financing and self-management are applied to autonomous formations and local soviets. [Words indistinct] is being worked out at the present time, and there is a draft law on the local economy and local self-management, which provides for the rights both of autonomous republics and local soviets.

[Otsason] I happen to be a member of the working group which is drafting the law on local self-management. In response to a number of questions, for example, there is a question here from Comrade Zaalanov from Moscow: Will our rayons, towns, and oblasts be granted similar independence to that for the republics we are talking about? Of course, it will not be the same, but the basic principle will be the same, that all local self-management bodies, the towns and rayons, should get their independent budget and, in connection with this, their independence in managing the economy of the region will increase considerably. But that is a matter for another draft law which will probably also be under discussion soon.

[Voznesenskiy] Just a few words about the autonomous republics now.

[Smirnov] This is a very serious question. We have discussed it and drafted a document, and so by general consensus we have formulated provisions which are fixed in the general principles, that a whole range of rights and powers which this document provides for Union republics should be delegated to autonomous republics. We understand that these are major national territorial formations, and of course they should be allocated broader powers than oblasts, than a town, than a rayon, a village soviet, and so forth, what we call the local soviets. Such a provision has been registered, and the only thing we have not managed to do is to make it specific enough, but we will be doing just that during further work on the draft law.

[Vozfnesenskiy] Nikolay Ivanovich, please.

[Maslennikov] I have asked to speak because of the question from Stepan Petrovich Matveyev from Moscow. He asks: Wouldn't it be better to call the program "Strong Center, Strong Republics, Strong Oblasts"? That is what he asks. Well, my opinion, for example, is that you call the program that, or strong republics. In the RSFSR we have 16 autonomic republics, six krays, 54 oblasts, including 5 autonomous oblasts, and 10 autonomous okrugs, so that there is probably a problem here.

[Vardzelashvili] (?In Russia altogether).

[Maslennikov] Yes. I am giving my own opinion.

[Vardzelashvili] Why not go as far as strong rayons, strong settlements, eh? [general laughter]

[Maslennikov] I will tell you that our national okrugs are presently developing very strongly. For example, in recent years the Aginskiy Buryatskiy National Okrug has increased per capita industrial production by a factor of three, Yuriy Dmitriyevich, but at the same time this national okrug has big problems of the social plane, and these have to be resolved.

[Voznesenskiy] So, dear comrades, listen to me for a minute. We are being asked today such a vast quantity of most interesting and, I would even say, most valuable questions for our further work, that you are already all snowed under by them. Please concentrate on carefully selecting the most essential ones from your viewpoint and on managing to answer precisely these questions by the end of the program.

While you are busy with this analytical work, I will ask Yuriy Dmitriyevich to give us an object lesson in brief replies to a series of questions which we passed on before all the others.

[Maslyukov] I'll try to be very brief. Comrade Yevgeney Ilich Vershenin, from Vladimir, speaks of the need for rational combination of industry-based and territorial administration. We have been speaking about it for more than 60 years and are looking at another document on this problem. We need the political and economic mechanism. When will it be drafted, and in the form of what documents? Comrades, the law is already being drafted. The law will be finalized in accordance with the results of nationwide discussion of the general principles, and will be submitted for confirmation to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Next question: Does the government intend to resign at the first session of the USSR Supreme Soviet? Yes, it does. If it wants to do so earlier, then a legal draft has to be submitted. That question is from Comrade Igor Vasiliyevich Kruglov.

Comrade Valeriy Mikhaylovich Zubov, from Moscow: Be so kind, please, as to say what the overall structure of the scheme of management in the country is; do the Union ministries remain, and in what quantity, and what are their new functions? What kind of ties are there between Union ministries and Union republics? I think that is a topic for a separate and long talk, but the new government which will exist after the Congress of People's Deputies and the session of the Supreme Soviet will prepare its own proposals. In any case, such a consolidation of the structure, the reduction in the number of ministries, is being prepared; proposals for examination are being prepared.

[Voznesenskiy] Now we are getting questions of a similar kind. For example, (Galina Sergeyevna Korolkovaya) has just asked one, and there are a number of others.

[Maslyukov] Comrade (Aleksandr Viktorovich Kozlov), an engineer, asks: A developed infrastructure is the guarantee of successful utilization of production protential. Why not include all-around development of the infrastructure as point one in the section on (?exchange) in the general principles. In my opinion, it it very correct to put it this way, and we will definitely study it very carefully, although there are quite serious directions in the general principles on this topic. But we will study the question once again.

Comrade (Sergey Arsentyevich Nefodov) asks: Is it not time we thought, in principle, about stopping construction of everything new, unifying the enterprises we have in the industries to enable better production, and building new ones only in exceptional cases? This is because we already have hundreds of thousands of enterprises, and we can fill the whole of the land with enterprises. In all probability we can fill the whole of the land with enterprises, but for the time being, we have not yet done so. I agree with the fact that it is necessary to severely curtail construction of new enterprises, to enhance the effectiveness of utilization of old enterprises, and lay more emphasis on reconstruction and retooling. There are, however, enterprises which it is impossible to reconstruct—they can only be built. To give an example, enterprises to manufacture enhanced integration microcircuits can only be created, because the conditions currently existing at any enterprise are unsuitable for manufacturing integrated circuits.

Furthermore, on the Law on Elections, the cooperative movement, and enterprises—(Valeriya Alekseyevna Kulikova) says that these matters and such like are insufficiently effective. They have surely been enshrined in the Constitution, but to what extent will they be effective? That is to say, this questions revolves round the effectiveness of the law. Comrades, that is how I would answer: They are effective to the extent to which we shall be disciplined and to which we shall observe these laws. I think that the law, or, to be more precise, the draft we are discussing today, is of fundamental significance, and that it will be observed without fail, or else the republics will simply find themselves unable to function; nor will there be any center, either strong or weak.

[Vozesenskiy] Why is it that you—well, not me, but all our television viewers....

[Maslyukov, interrupting] Lev Aleksandrovich, I am very sorry, but a most interesting question....

[Voznesenskiy] Well, do go ahead.

[Maslyukov] Can the Ministry of Finances and the USSR State Planning Committee be transferred to financial autonomy? This matter is of concern to very many listeners.

[Voznesenskiy] But is it also of concern to you?

[Maslyukov] Yes, I am concerned about it, but I think we will consider this matter.

[Voznesenskiy] All right, I, too, have an interesting question, put by Comrade (Reshetnikov). Why is it that everyone sitting in your studio is looking so gloomy? Can things really be all that bad? Well, who is to answer this, only very briefly? Please go ahead.

[Karimov] Can I answer in verse?

[Voznesenskiy] Oh yes, this is something quite unprecedented!

[Karimov] When you link up with your brother, shoulder to shoulder,
It is as nothing to shift a huge boulder,

But even a wise man's faith won't keep along,
With a brother whose heart's out of tune with his tongue.
So, we are not gloomy.

[Voznesenskiy] Thank you, thank you. Nonetheless, there are certain differences in the situation that takes shape in each of our republics, and television viewers draw attention to some of these differences. (Marina Viktorina Smirnova): This morning it was broadcast on the radio that as of 1 July this year, and in accordance with a decision by the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, mothers who bring up a child at home retain an uninterrupted length of service up until the child reaches 8 years of age, while for the country at large this figure is only 1 and ½ years. Mother and child benefits are also significantly going up. How does this decision tally with the principles of social justice? Is it really the case that Lithuania's working people work so very much better than the working people in Tyumen Oblast or Donbass? Please explain. (Ivan Fedorovich Bulayev) from Pushkino also asks essentially an identical question, referring to today's PRAVDA article "Family and Children," which mentions the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decree. Maybe you could tackle this? Be kind enough to do so.

[Sharks] Indeed, the law on strengthening state and social assistance to families with children was passed by a decree of the Supreme Soviet Preisdium a week ago. Well, I am of the view that these general principles were already put into practice in our country in 1989. To be brief, we have calculated that these measures cost us R22 million a year. Well, we reckon that enterprise, through their funds, will account for approximately R18 million, while the other R4 million will come from the republican budget.

[Unidentified voice] Enterprises subordinated to the all-union level?

[Sharks] Both the republican and all-union enterprises; those that create their own funds.

[Voznesenskiy] You have already begun to introduce the general principles?

[Sharks] We have begun to introduce the general principles already this year and, as you know....

[Maslyukov, interrupting] [Words indistinct] how can you begin without increasing production and only subsequently determine what has been earned? Revenues have been earned today, but what will happen tomorrow if your enterprise fails, if it wrecks the plan?

[Sharks] Well, we will look and see. Why should the plan be wrecked?

[Unidentified voice] One should, of course, begin with the production, and not with the distribution. That's the easiest way.

[Sitaryan] [Words indistinct] of course the republic made this decision, but I would like to focus attention on one aspect of the conversation we began with. Will it not be the case that the diktat of the all-union ministries will be replaced by the diktat of the republics? After all, according to the Law on Enterprises, you have no right to impose upon them any contributions which, as it were, are of the nature of obligatory expenditure—this is a direct encroachment on the enterprise. I would understand it if you accounted for this expenditure via the state budget of the republic.

[Sharks] A proportion is thus accounted for.

[Sitaryan] Why a proportion? On what basis, for example, do I issue a decree that makes it obligatory upon the enterprise, protected as it is by the Law on State Enterprise, which determines the range of its contributions, payments and so forth, to make compulsory contributions? I think that the enterprise can do this on a voluntary basis. However, once a decree is made, it becomes binding on me as a director. This, incidentally, serves to illustrate this fear experienced by some enterprises, and the same goes for the questions I have: Won't this financial autonomy lead to the enhancing or, to be more precise, to a replacement of one diktat with another? I think that we should bear these fears in mind.

[Voznesenskiy] The level of polemics in our broadcast has shot up considerably just lately. I would like to ask Buri Bachabekovich to speak again. May be he will find some ideas in prose?

[Karimov] All right, I would like to deal with another aspect of this task as it concerns, say, our Central Asian republics, including Tajikistan. If you take the children below 8 years of age, there are 1.3 million of them, more than 25 percent of the population of Tajikistan.

[Guseynov] So, the budget will be enough. [chuckles]

[Karimov] So, what, in this case, are we to do? Now if you take another aspect of the question, we have more hero mothers than anyone else. Where is social justice? If this question is to be tackled, it will surely have to be begun with Tajikistan; a start will have to be made with the Central Asian republics. And the question of affordability will, without fail, have to be looked into again during the process of tackling this question. Where, in this given case, is social equality? All in all, we are not against tackling this question, but if it has to be tackled, it will have to be tackled simultaneously for everyone. It is a very serious question.

[Voznesenskiy] Yes, literally a few words, a couple of words.

[Sitaryan] It is a question of fundamental significance. It was in the center of our attention when we were preparing this document. Here is a question from Comrade

(Oleg Konstantinovich Polutnikov), and it accords with what has been said. Won't republican financial autonomy lead to excessive inequality in the population's living standards?

[Voznesenskiy] Yes, there are many such questions.

[Sitaryan] It is not a simple question, and there are many such questions. We have little time and so, to be brief: First, the main types of social wealth, their level and nature, will, without doubt, be regulated at the all-union level. At the same time, according to the general principles, republics are indeed being granted rights to introduce, over and above the established all-union norms, their own additional payments, and systems of one kind or another. And of course each republic, having taken its own financial resources into account, and when financial autonomy has begun to operate, will determine where these things can be directed. Some will decide that they can be directed to give incentives to democratic policies; others will reach the conclusions that these things ought to be directed toward other purposes. That is why some differences will undoubtedly exist. But what ought to be borne in mind is that the all-union control over this process is not being removed, and it will be subject to regulatory measures.

[Unidentified voice] [Words indistinct] increments we have worked out.

[Voznesenskiy] Dear comrades. I now ask all of you to keep an eye on the clock. It seems to me that there are 21 of us, and we have less than 40 minutes till the end of the broadcast. If we, as economists, divide 40 by 20 at least, we will get 2 minutes for each one of you to speak. Let us regard these 2 minutes as the last ones for each speaker, and I will be asking you, one by one—let us please begin with Comrade Atadzhanov, let's say—for the duration of your 2 minutes, address yourselves, please, to the questions that are the most heartfelt ones as far as you are concerned.

[Atadzhanov] Lev Aleksandrovich, a large group of comrades, including Comrade (Churyzin) from Moscow, Comrade (Hasanov Agbaragimovich) from Moscow, Comrade (Krylatov) from Tashkent, Comrade (Bakhadyrov), also from Tashkent, mainly pose the question about the one-crop system—cotton—in Uzbekistan and the Central Asian Republics, and about the unsatisfactory provision to the population of consumer goods, above all, foodstuffs.

Yes, indeed. In Uzbekistan, in particular, the single crop system—cotton—has taken up all the main irrigated land in the republic, the most fertile land in the republic. And at present the republic is (?concerned) with curtailing to a greater extent the volume of production of cotton both in Central Asia and in Uzbekistan, too. Well, as is known, in 1985 our plans provided for some 5.3 million tonnes of cotton; in 1988 the plans already provided for 5.25 million, while as far as the year 1990 is concerned, the USSR State Planning Committee and the USSR Agro-Industrial Committee have already adopted a program to bring raw cotton production down to 5 million tonnes. That is to say there is a decrease. And the 150,000 hectares or so of irrigated land thus made available will go to animal husbandry, and to produce other types of food produce. So, how do we generally plan to tackle the issues connected with the provision of consumer goods in the republic?

We have worked out a program for Uzbekistan's development until the year 1995, and it was adopted at a [word indistinct] session of the USSR Council of Ministers. It provides for an increase in the production of consumer goods in Uzbekistan worth from R10.5 billion in 1989 to R18.5 billion in 1995. This gives rise—makes it essential, and will lead, to be more specific—to this: that a whole range of branches of the machine-building industry, light, textile, and other industries will have to be developed in order to produce consumer goods in our republic. This will considerably enhance the demand in our republic, which currently finds itself in 11th place or thereabouts.

[Voznesenskiy] Yes, Alikhan Rakhmatovich, our community—I have in mind the people gathered round this table. Just 2 minutes, as you have said, 2 minutes about the single crop system. It keeps the passage of time very much in their mind's eye, without a murmur. Apart from that, there is this request, addressed to me for some unknown reason, by (Iosif Abramovich Rafas), to answer. I address this request—addressed to me—to all our other comrades. Vitold Pavlovich, please go ahead:

[Fokin] From these interesting and important questions I chose two: Comrade (Viktor Mikhaylovich Ponomarchuk) from Lvow asks whether the general principles provide for changes to the existing procedure of deliveries of agricultural output to the all-union fund. This is because deliveries increase with every passing year, and less and less produce, correspondingly, remains at the disposal of oblasts and republics.

Well, let us recall how production and purchases of agricultural output are generally planned at present. All this is now produced at the level of the primary link, so to speak, in collective and state farms; subsequently, it is added up at the rayon, oblast, and the republican level. So I mean, of course, I think that Comrade (Ponomarchuk) is concerned about the deliveries to the all-union fund in the guise of state orders, which are indeed brought to the notice of a republic from above, that is to say by the USSR State Planning Committee, and, to be honest, I simply see no other way out, and I think that this is correct. It is another matter that it cannot be regarded as normal when, say, the tasks of delivering to the all-union fund grow faster than the volume of production of this or that output. This, naturally, encroaches on the producer's interests.

And the next question: (Nikolay Viktorovich Lebedev), an economist, is against the genuinely complex system of—and I quote—all manner of discounts and surcharges, subsidies and compensation payments. This is how (Nikolay Viktorovich) made these concepts, as it were, rhyme! In some things, Comrade (Lebedev) is right, no doubt about it. None of this makes for a strengthening of the relations between goods and money. But, after all, these measures are a matter of necessity; all these surcharges and discounts on individual articles are introduced only in order to interest labor collectives in producing labor-intensive output not to their liking, output which, nonetheless, is acutely needed by society. Thus, for instance, surcharges ranging between 5 and 20 percent are put on the range of goods for children; discounts have been increased on retail prices of individual types of material—say on cotton materials from between 35 to 70 percent—and clothes are made for children from these materials. And, of course, evidently no one will dispute that it is humane to produce goods for people of advanced age. This is a manifestation of social protection for lowly paid working people. Or, for example, take the subsidies on purchase prices. Who will produce milk or, say, meat, to run things at a loss? That is why in the Ukraine our budget provides some R7 billion for these purposes, you know. Can this be renounced? Yes. But then you must forthwith increase retail prices, something we are all against. And it is no coincidence that when he visited the Ukraine, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said: We are not ready for this, and we will, apparently, have to wait 2 or 3 years.

[Voznesenskiy] Thank you.

[Fokin] Or take, for example, subsidized purchase prices. Who will produce milk or meat, say, at a loss to himself? So in our Ukraine, say, the budget envisages some R7 billion to this end. Is it possible to relinquish this? It is, but then it will be necessary to immediately increase retail prices, which we all object to. And during his stay in our Ukraine, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said, not fortuitously, that we are not ready for that, and that it would evidently be necessary to wait for 2 or 3 years. Thank you.

[Voznesenskiy] Vladimir Viktorovich, please.

[Laptev] I find myself in a very difficult situation, because there is an enormous number of questions, but, following the chairman's appeal, I am forced to leave several questions to one side, particularly since they relate to the question of sovereignty, federation, and confederation—of which, generally, I have already spoken in part. But now, of those questions which I want to touch upon, I selected two. These are, firstly, a question from Comrade Skorban, chairman of a kolkhoz in Poltava Oblast, who writes—and I shall summarize, his note is fairly detailed here—that Article 11 of the Constitution speaks about natural resources as subject to exclusive ownership by the state, but not about other means of production. And why is it that other forms of property, apart from state property and property of the whole people, are placed in an unequal situation? Why should the apparatus express the interests of state property and the property of the whole people?

I should say that Article 11 of the Constitution speaks of the exclusive property of the state in the sense that it really cannot be handed over to become the property of public organizations, trade unions, or kolkhozes, for example. That is as regards these facilities.

And so far as other means of production are concerned, then, of course, both a kolkhoz and other cooperatives can be and are the owners of these means of production.

So far as the apparatus expressing the ownership interests of the whole people or of the state is concerned: This is of course wrong; we have to fight this, and I think that we have now just held democratic elections of representative bodies of power in our country, and doubtless our new parliament, the Supreme Soviet, and the Congress of People's Deputies will, to a significant degree I imagine, also fulfill the functions of the state as owner. That is, it will take decisions on the property of the whole people. All this won't be up to the apparatus, as was the case hitherto.

[Voznesenskiy] Vladimir Viktorovich....

[Laptev] And the second question—if you excuse me, I have a second question....

[Voznesenskiy] Thirty seconds, if you'll be so good, because, comrades....

[Laptev] Very briefly, although the question is very essential. It is a question from Comrade Roskov. And it is this: How, under the circumstances of extending the rights of enterprises, should the codification of economic legislation be carried out? Well, that is a very essential question, I would say a problematical question. We are now set the task of carrying out the codification of economic legislation, that is, of publishing a generalizing law along the lines of an economic code. Of course, an economic code should be an all-union law, because it establishes the national economic complex in law, and regulates interrepublican economic relations, but at the same time I imagine that the rights of the union republics should also be extended in this sphere. When an economic code is adopted, it will be necessary for it to provide for the union republics having the right to independently define the particular features of its application on their own territory....

[Voznesenskiy] Buri Bachabekovich, please.

[Laptev] ...That is, in this manner, the general and the particular will be combined.

[Voznesenskiy] Thank you. Yes. Buri Bachabekovich, please.

[Karimov] Dzumat Rusulov: By what means is it possible to increase the income of Tajikistan guided by general principles, inasmuch as Tajikistan is a raw materials base, and similar republics in Central Asia are raw material bases? How are they developing under the conditions of new economic management?

If the real conditions and starting level of the social and economic development of separate republics are not taken into account, then there will be even greater differences. Buf if, in working out social and economic and scientific and technical programs, the parameters of evening out social and economic development and the creation of the necessary basic conditions to realize them are taken into account, and if the status of these programs is legislatively secured, then we will develop well. Why? Insofar as I understand it, you have not been an appendage and you are not an appendage.

[Gostev] Probably one ought not to speak like that.

[Karimov] Well, in the given case, if the starting conditions are not taken into account in fact, we will....

[Gostev] As you please, you are not a raw-materials appendage in the country, of course.

[Karimov] Of course not.

[Gostev] You are taking part in the union-wide division of labor.

[Unidentified speaker] The formal division of labor.

[Gostev] In Central Asia we have a special climate where cotton is grown. It doesn't grow in Comrade Otsason's Estonia. So this division of labor is not an appendage. It is also important.

[Karimov] The question has been posed in such a way that I feel...why, given the abundance of labor resources in Tajikistan....

[Vozesenskiy] [Words indistinct] stage of the discussion. So, very briefly, please. When it comes to your speech you can use your 2 minutes to answer another comrade. Otherwise we shall never reach the end of our circle. Please end.

[Karimov] Why, given the abundance of labor resources....

[Kutyrkin] Well, I think that this circle will not get round to me.

[Karimov] Why, given the abundance of labor resources in Tajikistan, are workers from other regions of the country brought in for the construction of major projects? For example, the Nurek and Rogun GES? It is very simply that there were not enough highly qualified cadres. Now, these problems are being resolved locally.

[Voznesenskiy] That's all. Please, go ahead.

[Guseynov] I also have a number of questions, such as from Comrade Vladimir Petrovich Krechetov, I don't know from where. Will republican financial autonomy not lead to an even greater disparity in the level of the economic development of the republics? Well, this question has been answered in part. Well, I will briefly state my opinion. Firstly, I would stress that in the main we do not think of the economic life of a union republic in isolation from the deepening of the internationalizing of the country's economic life, close cooperation, widespread coproduction, and division of labor with all regions of the union-republics. Strictly speaking, we have now started to implement this complex of measures aimed at the implementation of a new concept for the development of republics. Well, there are questions of course. So far in the republic and the country—for instance, this was noted today—an accurate mechanism for regulating the relationship between created and utilized national income from the interests—I have in mind from the position of the interests of the regions and the integrated national economic complex of the country—has been lacking.

And this does bring about some disproportions in territorial development, leads to violations of the principle of social justice, and has an effect on interethnic relations. In fact, the opportunities for self-financing will depend to a large extent of the objectivity of the chosen stable norms of deductions from income to the budget. This would correspond with the aims of harmonizing the interest of the country and the union republics.

And—I am just ending—probably there is a more urgent need for a scientifically based methodology in appraising the contribution of each republic to the national economic complex of the country. There's my reply to that question.

[Voznesenskiy] Boris Ivanovich.

[Gostev] The flow of financial questions has increased. I can't answer all of them, but one question I feel has to be dwelled on.

[Voznesenskiy] Yes, yes, please.

[Gostev] When there is a budget deficit, how can financial autonomy for territories be implemented in practice? This is a very important question. Our budget indeed has a deficit. The Central Committee and the government have now decided to strengthen finances and strengthen the circulation of money; the task of republics switching to financial autonomy in fact consists of...[Gostev changes thought] It is an instrument for eliminating the budget deficit. So in the first instance, attention should be paid to the development of production, to increasing its effectiveness. Later, when we are earning money and the budget deficit has been eliminated, then it will be necessary to distribute benefits.

Otherwise, this will be built on sand. We ourselves can, or you can—let us put it like that—get us into difficulty, promising the earth and then having to take it all back. Our possibilities have to be commensurate here. You must first earn, eliminate the budget deficit, and only then, as they say, introduce benefits.

There is a whole series of other questions; although I have them in groups I cannot answer all of them. We will reply, comrades—but here, many comrades are concerned, Comrade Novikov from Moscow, Comrade Porosov from Balashikhi is concerned, and other comrades. Will it not be the case that what we assign to the local budget will be appropriated? Thus, the principle of financial autonomy has been posed: What is subject to the republic, is assigned to the local republican budget. This is the principle. So, there is no need to be concerned, comrades. Very important questions have been asked here. For example, on retaining expenditure on defense, this has already been published. Defense expenditures are indeed being reduced in the budget—this has been announced—by 14.2 percent. There is also a very important question about the work of unviable and loss-making enterprises; such work is being done. We will answer all specific questions, comrades, and I think that the role of finances will grow, and greater attention must in fact be devoted to the strengthening of the financial situation. This is what this draft is aimed at.

[Voznesenskiy] The financial situation both in each region and in the country as a whole.

[Gostev] Of course, and at the enterprise (?too).

[Voznesenskiy] And at the enterprise, first of all.

[Gostev] Of course.

[Voznesenskiy] Vladislav Georgiyevich, over to you.

[Kutyrkin] Yes. Boris Ivanovich Kislyakovskiy from Moscow asks: Will the outcome not be like what happened when the sovnarkhozes [councils of national economy which are central or regional economic management boards] were set up—namely, each republic will pursue a policy which gives priority to local interests and will do what is profitable? In that case all contracts will be breached.

It seems to me that we live and exist in a different time. First, the presence of long-term, goal-oriented comprehensive programs as major pre-plan documents and concepts. Second, the system of state orders. Third, the concentration in the hands of the center of the main basic industries of the economy predetermines a single strategy for our country's social and economic development. This is my first point.

Regarding the assertion that the republics will do what is profitable, it seems to me, on the one hand, questions connected specifically with the people are put under the jurisdiction of the republics and the republic will have to show a heightened interest and develop industries in order to improve the people's social living conditions. Second, a socialist market is being formed. Under these conditions the direct ties between the republics will expand. Unser the conditions of these direct ties the system of inter-republican specialization will probably function and develop. Of course, each republic will do what is economically expedient and profitable, but through the direct ties with the other regions try to secure overall state interests.

[Voznesenskiy] Okay, comrades, time is running out. We need to go over to even briefer answers: not more than 1 minute, maximum 1.5 minutes. Please go ahead.

[Sharka] Lev Aleksandrovich....

[Voznesenskiy] I think that the left flank supports me.

[Several voices] Yes.

[Voznesenskiy] Yes. Please go ahead.

[Sharka] As is obvious, today we will not have time to talk about the Baltic republics and Belorussia changing over to work under the general principles as soon as 1990, to our common regret.

[Voznesenskiy] Yes.

[Sharka] So, you are out of luck.

[Voznesenskiy] Now, a few questions. How is it intended to finance the teaching of the national and Russian languages in connection with interethnic relations? Well, there are no differences at all. After that, there is also an engineer from Lithuania, Alekseyunas, if I have read correctly, who asks: Who should we appeal to in order to have certain establishments of our—these are mainly ecologically damaging ones—closed? We have no need for them. Well, we will view and study this with the ministries. We will see what establishments will be placed under republican jurisdiction. Well, this is one of those questions. It is difficult to know at first glance, so to speak, whether or not an establishment is necessary.

[Voznesenskiy] This is impossible. But it must be studied.

[Sharka] We will study it.

[Voznesenskiy] Over to you, Comrade Abdullayev.

[Abdullayev] Lev Aleksandrovich, here out of an entire group of questions I have selected one single question only, which, I think, will interest everyone. Comrade Lebedev from Moscow asks the question: until when, instead of firm economically justified prices, will enterprises, industries, and regions be guided by the intricated system of all kinds of rebates, extra charges, state grants and compensations?

[Unidentified speaker] This question has already been answered. Vitold Pavlovich (?answered it).

[Abdullayev] That is to say, a question. I think that comrades here have replied to it. But I think, nevertheless, that the question of fixing, well then, correct prices, for all kinds of output being produced, this, I think, is something we cannot ignore.

And the second question, which I would like to (?answer) in half a second, as they say. Comrade Falin from Moscow says: In general principles, we are approving the changeover of many republics to self-management, whereas at the same time throughout the whole of Europe integration processes are under way. I would only like to say here, comrades, that we, as a whole, are in favor of the openness of the economy, the establishment of direct mutually advantageous ties with all republics, including, also with, as they say, our neighboring Central Asian republics and other republics. I believe that it is precisely the general principles which open up a new prospect in the establishment of mutually advantageous direct economic ties. That is to say, we must say that (?in return) we receive economic ties of a new quality between the union republics.

[Unidentified speaker] Raisa Aksimovna Moyeseyenko—I'm reading it out as it's written here; if there are perhaps any mistakes, then please excuse me—so, will it not bring about an increase in the management apparatus not employed according to work specification in the sphere of production; will it not lead to a further worsening of the economy; and has the question been studied of the numbers of ministries and departments in, for example, the United States, in the development of regions where these organizations and the numbers in them are several times fewer than in our country? Next, comrade Nikolay Vasiliyevich Volosatov proposes that all industrial enterprises which are located on the territory of a republic be put under the jurisdiction of the republics. And Comrade Valentin Ivanovich Sherstyuk says that some kind of authoritiative overall state body is required and suggests returning to the idea and the revival of the Leninist VSNKH [Supreme Council of the National Economy, 1917-1932]. All of this group relates to one...don't you see, these are completely contradictory questions. I would say this: Of course, do we need a center of the federation? We probably do, because if a federation does not have a center, then probably there isn't a federation either, and there's absolutely nothing to talk about. As far as reducing the apparatus of ministries—central ministries—is concerned, then today it has been reduced by about 30 percent, or just a little bit less; 600,000 persons have left to go into the national economy, but at enterprises, unfortunately, a reverse picture is taking shape. A very great increase is taking place. But now we are syaing that in our principles, comrades, all of this will be under the jurisdiction of the republics, and the republics must tackle this question in an efficient way.

As far as the United States is concerned, I would not like to criticize the United States, but I'll quote just one figure: For example, in the ministry of agriculture in the United States there are 11,000 people. In our ministry, I don't know if there are more than 1,500 people.

[Voznesenskiy] But on the other hand we beat them in numbers of ministries.

[Maslyukov] The numbers need to be reduced, and very sharply. Incidentally, in the Gosplan numbers have been reduced 33 percent. That's the first group of questions.

[Voznesenskiy] Yuriy Dmitriyevich, but you see democracy is in action in our country and that means that everyone gets the same amount of time....

[Maslyukov] I just want 5 seconds.

[Voznesenskiy] Five seconds? That will do, yes.

[Maslyukev] Muras Akhmetovich Akhmetov from Alma-Ata asks why I am against the construction of a metro in the town of Alma-Ata. Comrade Muras Akhmetovich Akhmetov, I am in favor. Build, for God's sake, only at the beginning calculate your budget to see if you can carry this through.

[Voznesenskiy] Aleksandr Ivanovich.

[Smirnov] I've finished gathering questions which in essence concern our future work, comrades. The subject is about possible socioeconomic and even political consequences of the implementation of the general principles, that is, those questions to which we have given much thought and work, but judging from the fact that we are being asked them, we will still have to do much work, and especially from the point of view of forming an economic mechanism, because questions are being put—and I can't even say from where, there are so many towns and regions—as follows: Will a weakening of the center not take place? Will this not lead to a strengthening of autarchy, parochialism, and arbitrariness, and what we were saying about intensifying socioeconomic differences between the republics, and so on? That is, these are questions to which we will give an answer about the work, in continuing to work on our document.

[Voznesenskiy] Thank you, for the brevity, too. Omar Georgiyevich.

[Vardzelashvili] I want to answer just one question.

[Voznesenskiy] Splendid.

[Vardzelashvili] [Name indistinct] Murjiknel from Tbilisi asks: What difficulties may we come up against in forming the republic's budget following putting the general principles into operation? Well, Yuriy Dmitriyevich said at the the very start that in our (?economy) discussion frequently arose, and one of the questions over which discussion has arisen is the question of compensation on retail prices for meat, dairy produce, and other products which have subsidized prices. In other words, without resolving this question, that is, in resolving this question, as presented to us in the draft general principles, we will certainly come up against great difficulties, but we think that since the worst trouble lies with the presence of subsidized prices, we ought either to give them up—since to continue with them will bring more harm than benefit—or compensation should (?be paid by the same bodies as those who establish prices), while the policy of price-setting should remain with union bodies.

[Voznesenskiy] Rein Augustovich, one question and one answer.

[Otsason] Why has the taking out of goods from the Baltic republics been stopped? Even parcels are not allowed, and people arriving in the republics are not allowed to buy anything, asks Alekseyeva from Volgograd Oblast.

[Voznesenskiy]...and a number of other people.

[Otsason]...Yes, and a number of others. The answer is this: The main cause is our budget, I reckon, its deficit, the fact that we have an excessive amount of money but there are no goods to buy. It has begun to be very acutely felt in Estonia. In all probability, there are not enough funds for goods. The point is that consumer goods are released to the trade sector but it is, mainly, not the ones that are being produced, the ones for which we receive funds. Funds are surely earmarked for the population of the republic and not for those who [word indistinct]. I will give one example of why this question is acute. We have found that very often the main problem is that such goods are taken away for the purpose of reselling them for profit, judging by the range of goods available. This has become exacerbated lately, incidentally, and this is so in connection with the cooperatives. Last year we discovered a cooperative in Tallinn which, in the space of 1 year, sold R1 million worth of furniture to other republics, at the expense of republican funds. That is why I agree that this form of economic protection of the local market is primitive and it must be condemned, but in such a way that [words indistinct].

[Voznesenskiy] Vladimir Yefremovich.

[Abramov] Well, I will just answer one question.

[Voznesenskiy] That is it, just one.

[Abramov] Can republican bodies dispose of, if only in part, their own resources as they see fit, including those which are of strategic significance? Can they trade with foreign countries, asks [name indistinct] from Leningrad. Of course they can, and there are examples in our republic of us and of our enterprises trading with foreign countries, in particular the republic itself, directly so [words indistinct]. Well, there are certain rules and regulations set by the state, and these are observed. The last thing I would like to add, Lev Aleksandrovich, is that an examination has shown that much work is ahead of us in preparing for the transition to self-financing. In connection with this, the question of whether it is expedient to carry out experiments prior to that arises again.

[Voznesenskiy] Well, yes, Nikolay Ivanovich, please go ahead.

[Maslennikov] Two brief questions. Ashkumbayev, a postgraduate student from the Bauman Higher Technical Educational Establishment in Moscow. What can Moscow contribute to the system of regional financial autonomy? I reckon—and state planning committees do, too—that the city of Moscow is the best prepared region for a transition to self-financing. There is an organized industry here. The column of industrial output is—I think—the highest in the country. Practically all regions avail themselves of the services and organization of Moscow enterprises. Many of them can be made to go over to financial autonomy. I am for this. There is a second question, and I will be quick here. Ivan Sergeyevich Dovshin from Yaroslavl: What was the reason behind setting up the main planning and economic directorates, attached to oblast level executive committees? As distinct from the previous oblast level planning commissions, the main planning and economic directorates have the function of comprehensively planning the entire development of territories, irrespective of what department they are subordinated to, and to coordinate the work of all enterprises.

[Voznesenskiy] Are there, among the comrades yet to speak, volunteers who are ready to refrain from answering? No? Mkrtych Tsolakovich, you have 40 seconds.

[Mkrtchyan] Well, Comrade Gabrelyan from Moscow asks this question: In what way do the republics intend to compensate for the losses of electric power? Are there republics which are going over to financial autonomy? The draft under examination contains not only the principles of restructuring of economic aspects of the life of our society, but also represents a manifestation of the humane ideas characteristic of the current stage in our country's development. In this respect, the draft envisions making use of the system of financing of the all-union budget, by way of grants and subsidies, so this way of dealing with the matter will make it possible for the republic to go over to financial autonomy. The second direction....

[Voznesenskiy, interrupting] [Words indistinct] but I cannot offend all the other comrades. That is why, comrades, we are going over....

[Mkrtchyan, interrupting] But I still have 15 seconds left.

[Voznesenskiy] Fifteen seconds? Well, fire away then.

[Mkrtchyan] The second direction is to set up on the republic's territory joint enterprises with foreign involvement. The third issue is that of cost-cutting measures. The republic has this program: Through stepping up the economy drive, we will also ensure an acceleration in the construction of Razdan GRES [state regional electric power station].

[Voznesenskiy] Comrade Begaliyev.

[Begaliyev] The question is a brief one, put by Ibragimov from Frunze. In a republic which is a raw material republic, everything is taken out—the republic does not process, and increases subsidies. I think the question is well put. We mention this during our conversation. [Sentence indistinct]. The second question is put by Comrade Nikolay Sambetovich Izgibayev from Moscow Oblast. What is to become of the Aral Sea in connection with the planned cascade of hydroelectric power stations? I can report that there are no plans to divert water prior to the construction of the cascade of the hydroelectric power stations, and so the interests of the Aral Sea will not be encroached upon.

[Voznesenskiy] Comrade Aboltyn, 30 seconds.

[Aboltyn] Well, there is a group of questions which boil down to this: that it was said during a meeting with the workers that all the Baltic republics are operating at a loss as far as the country is concerned. I think that this is the other side of the coin with respect to the problem of subsidies. That is why we said: Let us have market prices as soon as possible, and the agreements I have mentioned represent a step towards this.

[Voznesenskiy] Stepan Aramaisovich.

[Sitaryan] There are many questions and so I will be brief. The first group of questions: There is no doubt that the prospects of strengthing and developing territorial financial autonomy are connected with improving prices. Many weaknesses and distortions of the present are a reflection of the distortions and weaknesses within the existing system of prices. Second: Have we studied the experience of other countries? Yes we have, that of Yugoslavia, China, the United States, Switzerland, and Canada alike—all this we did study but it is clear that we let all that pass by, that all that passed our structure and our economy by.

[Voznesenskiy] Georgiy Petrovich.

[Badey] Literally a couple of words. Why do those engaged in planning now pay more attention to the organizational aspects of the work? Because this is what we now need for our practice. The time for discussions has come to an end. It is necessary to begin work.

[Voznesenskiy] Yuriy Dmitriyevich, please go ahead with your concluding remarks.

[Maslyukov] Comrades, the planned measures to restructure the management of the economic and social spheres of the union republics are, as I have already said today, a major step—but this is merely the first step in our work. Specific forms of management in the territories will be developing in keeping with the development of other directions of our economic reform. These are the areas of pricing—the system of pricing—taxation, wholesale trade, and so forth. Without that, a full transition is, of course, impossible.

Today's discussion, and already the reactions that have appeared in the press, show that very many problems still exist in the current state of reorganization of territorial management. The disputes that arose here also confirm this. Many of these problems will be removed during a nationwide discussion, during further work by our team which, Lev Aleksandrovich, is not being disbanded, but continues its work and will actively study all matters which arise, including the matters which have been brought to our attention but which we will not succeed in answering [during this program]. However, comrades, the main thing is that as of 1991 everyone ought to have made the transition, while in 1990 some republics may, surely, try out individual elements which must, without fail, be agreed upon with the State Planning Committee and considered jointly—together, perhaps, with our commission—so that we may be prevented from taking steps that would violate the main laws I have mentioned: the Law on State Enterprise, the Law on the Cooperative Movement, and so on. That is why a large amount of serious work is ahead of us. I thank all the viewers for their attention they accorded our team, and wish to give an assurance that we will continue our work.

[Voznesenskiy] I want—probably that is the only thing I will manage to do—to wish the commission and generally all those who are involved in working out this document, which is of fundamental importance for the life of the country, success in this exceedingly difficult work. Thank you all for your participation and thanks to the comrade TV viewers for their unflagging attention. All the best.

'Powerful Tremor' Registered in Spitak Area 30 Mar

No Human Casualties

LD3103142389 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 31 Mar 89

[Text] A report from Yerevan—at 2036 on 30 March a powerful tremor with the force of up to 7.5 points [scale unspecified], was registered in the zone of the Spitak earthquake.

Its epicenter, as has been reported by the Armenian Academy of Sciences, is situated between Leninakan and Gukasyan. There are no casualties. Emergency buildings have been destroyed in Gukasyanskiy Rayon. Approximately 270 cattle died.

During the last week no soil vibrations were observed here. These, following the December disaster, became a normal phenomenon for this zone. Proceeding from this, specialists expected that the energy that has accumulated would be discharged. The seat of the new tremor lies at a small depth of some 5 km. That is why it had a perceptible force on the surface.

11,000 Abandon Already Damaged Homes

NC0104085589 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1600 GMT 31 Mar 89

[Text] An earthquake struck Armenia on 30 March 1989 at 2135 local time. The epicenter was in Gukasyanskiy rayon, 35 km from Leninakan and 99 km from Yerevan. According to preliminary data, the tremors measured between 7 and 7.5 points at the epicenter, 6 and 6.5 in Leninakan, and 3 in Yerevan. There were no casualties, though various buildings that had been damaged earlier collapsed. In Leninakan, the Gukasyanskiy, Amasiyskiy, and Akhuryanskiy Rayons, Ani, and a number of other regions approximately 2,000 to 2,500 families—that is, about 11,000 individuals—abandoned previously partially damaged high-rise buildings, which sustained additional damages as a result of the new tremors. The aftereffects of the earthquake are being studied.

Arutyunyan, Silayev Visit Site

NC0204090389 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0425 GMT 2 Apr 89

[From the review of SOVETAKAN AYASTAN]

[Text] As we have already reported, an earthquake struck Armenia on 30 March. Its epicenter was at [word indistinct] Gukasyanskiy Rayon. According to preliminary data, the tremors measured between 7 and 7.5 at the epicenter and there has been substantial damage in the quake zone.

Suren Arutyunyan, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo Commission and the first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, and Ivan Silayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, visited Gukasyanskiy Rayon on 1 April. Comrades Arutyunyan and Silayev familiarized themselves with the concerns of the local population. It became obvious that the new destruction has further exacerbated the housing problem. In Gukasyanskiy Rayon alone, nearly 240,000 square meters of habitable space was destroyed on 30 March. Comrades Arutyunyan and Silayev visited the site where the construction of the new village of Arteni, in place of the old devastated village, is going ahead at full speed. One of the articles in the paper is about this visit by Arutyunyan and Silayev.

Georgian Leader Rejects Abkhaz Secession Bid

PM0204173789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Apr 89 Morning Edition p 2

[Own correspondent T. Chanturiya report under the rubric "Union Republic Supreme Soviet Sessions": "Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic"]

[Text] The extraordinary 11th Session of the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet, 11th Convocation, discussed organizational questions. As reported earlier in IZVESTIYA (No 89), the Supreme Soviet complied with P.G. Gilashvili's request to be relieved of the duties of chairman of the republic Supreme Soviet on his retirement. The session elected O.Ye. Cherkeziya, former chairman of the Georgian SSR Council of Ministers, to this post. Z.A. Chkheidze was appointed chairman of the republic Council of Ministers, and O.V. Kvilitaya was appointed first deputy chairman.

The session endorsed changes in the composition of the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, ratified Supreme Soviet Presidium decrees, and set up a republic Supreme Soviet commission on matters of restoring justice concerning victims of repressions in the thirties, forties, and early fifties.

At the request of Deputy G. Chogovadze, in connection with the political situation which has taken shape in the Abkhaz Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR]) and which is causing serious concern among the entire population of Georgia, the session was addressed by D.I. Patiashvili, first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, although this was not part of the agenda.

When and for what reason did the situation in Abkhazia deteriorate?

On 18 March a rally of thousands of Abkhazia residents was held at Lykhny village, Gudautskiy Rayon. The only point on the agenda was a demand for the status of the Abkhaz ASSR to be changed. A letter addressed to the CPSU Central Committee general secretary and the USSR Council of Ministers chairman "On restoring to Abkhazia the status of Soviet Socialist Republic conferred on it in 1921, when V.I. Lenin was alive" was read out at the meeting. This letter was signed at the meeting by a number of members of the Abkhaz party oblast committee [obkom] bureau, including obkom First Secretary B. Adleyba.

On 25 March a counterrally attended by many thousands of people belonging to the Georgian section of the population was staged in Sukhumi, where a sharp protest was voiced against the decision adopted at Lykhny. A rally was held in the rayon center of Gali.... Another rally took place in the Georgian capital.

What has happened was not entirely unexpected. The sentiments expressed at the Lykhny gathering had been set out earlier in a letter to the 19th party conference, they have been heard at other meetings, and they have been reflected in the local press. Last December the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee discussed the implementation of the government resolution on Abkhazia. Central Committee secretaries and bureau members met with the autonomous republic's working people, intelligentsia, young people, and party and soviet aktiv....

The Georgian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau, D.I. Patiashvili said, had expressed a negative attitude to the key demands of the gathering at Lykhny village, taking the view that they run counter to the spirit of the 27th CPSU Congress and 19th CPSU Conference decisions. They lack the support of the non-Abkhaz section of the autonomous republic's population and are unacceptable to the working people of Georgia as a whole. And, last but not least, they are at variance with the legal standards of national state building in the USSR in accordance with which, under Article 78 of the USSR Constitution, the territory of a union republic (and this is precisely what is at issue) cannot be changed without its agreement.

The Georgian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau had condemned attempts to use strong-arm tactics against party and state organs in order to resolve complex political issues which concern the interests of Georgia's multinational population. The only possible solution is a democratic discussion of overdue problems.

Georgians Protest Secession Demand

AU0204204589 Paris AFP in English 1924 GMT 2 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow, April 2 (AFP)—Some 10,000 ethnic Georgians protested Sunday in Abkhazia against nationalist Abkhaz demands to free the autonomous Soviet republic from the authorites in Georgia, a Georgian source said.

Zviad Gamsakhurdiya, a Georgian nationalist based in Georgia's capital Tbilisi, said Sunday's rally was the latest in a series concerning Abkhazia, which lies east of the Black Sea and is part of the Georgian republic.

Mr. Gamsakhurdiya said Abkhaz militants want the region, where 213,000 of the population are ethnic Georgians and 83,000 are ethnic Abkhazians, according to a 1979 census, to become completely separate from Georgia.

Sunday's rally in the Abkhaz capital Sukhumi followed violent clashes on Saturday in the town of Lesselidze in which a number of Georgians were injured, six of them being hospitalised at Sukhumi, Mr. Gamsakhurdiya said. Abkhazians fired shots and threw stones at 2,000 Georgians holding a demonstration against the local nationalists' demands and police reinforcements were sent from Sukhumi, said Mr. Gamsakhurdiya, contacted by telephone.

Mass meetings of Georgian nationalists to discuss the Abkhaz issue have been held since March 25 at Tbilisi, he added.

Mr. Gamsakhurdiya said that several thousand Abkhazians held a demonstration in the autonomous republic on March 18 calling for the region to be given federal republic status.

Georgian nationalists believe the movement is supported by a number of leading figures in Moscow who want Georgia's own nationalist movement to be checked.

Agricultural

Agricultural Seminar-Conference Held in Omsk

Ligachev Comments

LD3103170789 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 31 Mar 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A zonal seminar-conference began in Omsk today on the tasks facing party, local soviet, and economic bodies in expanding cooperation between industrial and agricultural enterprises and in developing family plots, collective horticulture, and market gardening.

[Correspondent Ye. Sinitsyn] The seminar-conference opened here in the house of political education. The invited participants are people on whom, above all, the future development of this most important branch of the national economy depends. It is known that Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev will speak. Because one cannot include even one-tenth of a speech in a short report, I asked him before the seminar opened to talk about the subjects on which he will be concentrating. [video shows conference participants arriving; interview with Ligachev]

[Begin Ligachev recording] Well, first of all, I would like to mention that, as is known, the party Central Committee March plenum examined matters pertaining to the party's agrarian policy in today's conditions. It determined the main aims of this policy and its basic guidelines and principles. Now the most important thing for all of us is to put the decisions adopted into practice. It is known that the plenum advocated variety and equality among all forms of management and forms of organizing socialist ownership. This refers to collective and state farms, agro-industrial associations, agro-combines, peasant labor farms, and private subsidiary plots belonging to enterprises and citizens, i.e. all forms of farming. We know that it is mainly the collective and state farms that provide the food stocks in our country.

Prior to the Central Comittee plenum a seminar was held in Orel Oblast under the leadership of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. There, in effect, there was an analysis of matters pertaining to the refinement of economic relations within the state and collective farms and matters concerning the social development of the countryside.

The present conference concerns matters connected with the development of cooperation between industry and agriculture to increase food production and the development of private plots and of collective horticulture and market gardening. Today there will also be an examination of matters relating to the development of private subsidiary plots. I think we have every reason to describe these as family plots, for they are based around the family. It should be noted that private family plots produce 24 percent of our country's entire food stocks. Overall, if we look at the total figures, there are 52 million families in our country engaged in breeding cattle and growing potatoes, vegetables, and fruit on private plots, and horticultural and market-gardening allotments. You can see, then, that private plots, horticulture, and market-gardening account for a large proportion of food production in our country. All the restrictions on the development of this kind of farming must be lifted. After all, what is a family farm? In fact, it is a farm based on leasing: The owner has a plot of land, pays an agricultural tax, and disposes of all that he produces at his own discretion. He consumes some of the produce himself and the surplus goes to the market. So in effect, he is just like a leaseholder. Literally all the restrictions must be lifted, particularly regarding the allotment of land. If one, two, three hectares are required for a private plot, they should be allocated. Help should be given with young animals, cattle, seeds, and many other types of resources in order to develop such farming.

I would like to say that we must seek to resolve the tasks set by the March plenum as rapidly as possible. In the very near future we have to take the sting out of the food problem, or at least alleviate it substantially, and then in the 13th 5-Year Plan we need to ensure stable food supplies in our country. [end recording]

[Sinitsyn] The conference was opened by Aleksandr Vladimirovich Vlasov. In the presidium are Oleg Dmitriyevich Baklanov, as well as Stepan Alekseyevich Shalayev, Viktor Mironenko, senior workers in the party Central Committee and ministers. Later on, Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev; Yevgeniy Dmitriyevich Pokhitaylo, first secretary of the Omsk party obkom [oblast party committee]; gave a speech. [video shows participants as named] Before leaving to visit the oblast's rayons, the participants in the seminar-conference took a look around an exhibition of equipment, machinery, and technology used in agriculture, including private subsidiary plots. [video shows farm equipment]

Ligachev Gives Report

LD0104171289 Moscow TASS in English 1749 GMT 1 Apr 89

[Text] Omsk April 1 TASS—A regional seminar-conference ended on Saturday in the city of Omsk, Western Siberia. Its participants discussed questions connected with using the potentialities of cooperation of industry and agriculture, of collective orchards and vegetable gardens in the light of resolutions of the plenary meeting of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee on agrarian issues held in March 1989.

Yegor Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, called attention in his report to the insufficient participation of factory farms in the improvement of food supply for factory and office workers. They are facing a difficult task: to reach by 1995 the production of no less than 30 kilograms of meat and 50 kilograms of milk per worker. In this connection he urged to treat those farms not as something of secondary importance, but as major agrarian production shops of industrial enterprises.

A significant part of his report dealt with the role of individual households of rural residents and people living in workers' townships. Ligachev recalled that the share of income coming from individual households in the overall income of a family living in the countryside stands at about 25 per cent, which is an average level for the country. In some parts of the country the figure reaches 40 per cent.

He cited in his report letters sent to the Central Committee. People complain that their desire to cultivate land comes up against some obstacles which are difficult to understand. Ligachev stressed that all the obstacles should be removed, that people should be given individual plots of land for cultivating orchards and vegetable gardens, that it is necessary to help people in this undertaking in every way.

The Central Committee secretary spoke about the production of farm machinery to be used at family farms, about factors hampering the development of livestock-breeding and about the role played by collective orchards and vegetable gardens in improving food supply.

Last year, when the Central Committee plenary meeting was being prepared, a similar conference was held in the Oryol Region, in the central part of the Russian Federation. It analysed questions connected with the improvement of economic relations at collective and state farms and the social development of the countryside. Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev took part in the work of the conference.

Vlasov Interviewed

LD3104230289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 31 Mar 89

[Text] An all-union seminar-conference opened in Omsk today. Those taking part are discussing the tasks of party, local soviet, and economic organs in expanding cooperative relations between industrial and agricultural enterprises, developing the family household plot, collective horticulture, and market gardening in light of the decisions of the March CPSU Central Committee plenum. After the opening of the seminar, the participants went into the rayons of the oblast. Our special correspondent Igor Zorin interviewed Aleksandr Vladimirovich Vlasov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, chairman of the Russian Federated Soviet Socialist Republics [RSFSR] Council of Ministers, when the latter and other conference participants were being shown work operations in Tavricheskiy Rayon, Omsk Oblast.

[Zorin] I have just returned from Tavriya, in Siberia, I am putting the tape in the recorder now, so do listen to a recording of the interview with Comrade Vlasov.

[Begin recording] [Zorin] Good day. May I ask you a question?

[Vlasov] Please do.

[Zorin] Tell us, please, your impressions on the first day of the conference in Omsk.

[Vlasov] Well, I am most impressed, even on the first day of the conference, and I think all the conference participants feel the same: That is, a very great deal of work has already been done.

[Zorin] Here on the spot?

[Vlasov] Right here, in Omsk Oblast, to develop individual farms. They have virtually met demand. Now integration between precisely these individual farms and enterprises is going well, and integration of backward farms with industrial enterprises, mutual assistance, and mutual links. Speaking of the first day of the conference, we have visited an exhibition.

[Zorin] Is it good?

[Vlasov] It is a good exhibition. You know, it is an encouraging one, let's put it like that. That is, today enterprises are already producing minitractors, motorized units, cultivating tools, and small machinery. True, the quantities manufactured are small: Last year in the Russian Federation we received about 30,000 minitractors while there is a need for millions, but today specific measures are already being taken. A program has been drawn up to increase production of all this small-scale machinery for individual farms and leasehold farmers. In the next 2 or 3 years, I think, the demand will be virtually met.

[Zorin] Aleksandr Vladimirovich, the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] regions of Orel, Belgorod, and today Omsk, have turned out to be the trailblazers in restructuring of the countryside and life in the countryside. How does the Russian Federation—I ask you, as the chairman of the Russian Federation Council of Ministers—intend to go on to implement the decisions of the Party Central Committee plenum?

[Vlasov] The very fact, I think, that a conference was held in Orel on giving a boost to backward and lagging farms and neglected villages gave concrete experience. And after the Orel conference, specific programs were drawn up in all oblasts, depending on the conditions and the situation: In some places it is planned to boost 50 neglected villages, elsewhere 100. And now, taking advantage of the experience of people in Orel Oblast, industrial enterprises are getting involved in this work. In addition, there have been conference seminars in Kharkov and Belgorod. In Belgorod there was a concrete example of how industrial enterprises are participating in helping the countryside: Every year in Belgorod Oblast industrial enterprises submit about R80 million for work in the countryside. And now, in Omsk Oblast, the same principle is applied, though a bit less. I think that the present seminar is aimed precisely toward disseminating the experience which already exists in many oblasts in the Russian Federation widely throughout the territory of the republic. The level should be precisely that in virtually every oblast.

Today, for instance, we visited Tavricheskiy Rayon. The target we set was to set up in every rayon small plants for processing agricultural produce. (?in my opinion) we sometimes talk a lot but do very little. But here things have been done: There is a rayon agro-industrial association, which carries out procurement of any surpluses of agricultural produce and processes these here. The processing is done at the request of the population. This is a good example. Take today's shops. Farm shops have been organized, an area for trading in building materials has been organized, at the request of citizens, each individually on account.

The whole principle of our conference today, the main task, is precisely to set in motion active work on setting up and developing individual farms. In the RSFSR we have 16 million individual farms—these are ready-made lessees. We only have to give them assistance. [end recording]

[Zorin] I may add that tomorrow the agrarian conference in Omsk will continue, and will end in the evening.

Vlasov Visits Tavricheskiy Rayon

LD0104195989 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 1 Apr 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] [Announcer] The zonal seminar conference on the tasks of party, local soviet, and economic bodies in expanding cooperative relations between industrial and agricultural enterprises, developing the family household plot, collective horticulture, and market-gardening continued in the town of Omsk today.

Two routes and four groups. In this way do the participants in the seminar- conference work, changing places in many of the oblast's rayons and farms. They are interested in literally everything, from specific aid that has been rendered to private plots by collective farms, to the principles underpinning the work of enterprises' subsidiary farms.

Today one of the routes included a visit to the hothouse combine belonging to the transport engineering factory. How many of these hothouses are there at our works? You can count them on the fingers of both hands. Yet all this was built by the workers themselves—for their own benefit, for their own dinner tables. One could quite boldly term this an agro-shopfloor. Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev remarked that these should not be subsidiary or auxiliary, but full-fledged shopfloors, in existence at every enterprise.

There are many problems that are bothering people; sometimes they are acute problems that need to be resolved quickly. Aleksandr Vladimirovich Vlasov was visiting Tavricheskiy Rayon:

[Begin recording] [Vlasov] The task today is to completely meet requirements for the plots, for land. Then production will increase...[interrupted by woman]

[Unidentified woman] There is not enough compound feed for us.

[Vlasov] You do not have enough compound feed?

[Woman] Of course. It's also a bit on the expensive side at R18 a quintal. That's expensive, you know. You know, everyone would keep two or three piglets. They would give up two and hang on to one.

[Vlasov] Yes, that's expensive. Evidently it is time for the collective and state farms to absorb this, and then work under contract. You would draw up a contract with the state farm, and then it would be a bit cheaper.

[Woman] I would like it to be a bit cheaper. But that is how it is here. It is not too bad.

[Vlasov] I think there must be integration. As it happens, issues such as these were posed by the conference participants: The integration of individual farming with state and collective farms. Not everything has been fully worked out yet. I feel more collective and state farms need to embark on private lines of communication with individual plots and family plots.

[Woman] Yes, yes. Of course.

[Vlasov] They should help them and build for them, build a basis for them and build outbuildings for the family household plots then things would be a bit cheaper.

[Woman] That is what we do, but you see—you work away and you try hard; everything is very good and we have got everything in the shops. But of course, what is needed is a little support....

[Vlasov] We will, we will support you. Total support; total support. [end recording]

[Announcer] A plenary session was held in the latter half of the day. The outcome of the seminar was summed up. In his speech Oleg Dmitriyevich Baklanov spoke about what the defense industry is currently doing for agriculture. [passage omitted] [video shows Ligachev at the transport engineering factory hothouse, then walking between rows of plants. Vlasov speaking outside and conversing with woman. Shots of plenary session and close up of Baklanov]

Agricultural Developments for 27 Mar-2 Apr

LD0204235989

[Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian on 27 March to 2 April, unless indicated otherwise. Times of broadcast, given in GMT, are in parenthesis at the end of each item.

27 March

Sugar beet sowing began in south Kazakhstan today. Cereals are being sown here, with large scale work in Chimkent and Dzhambul Oblasts. Sowing of barley and perennial grasses has started in Alma-Ata Oblast. (0800)

The area previously sown to cotton is being cut in both Uzbekistan and Tajikistan. This spring, 13,000 hectares will be sown to vines, vegetables, and feed crops instead of cotton in Uzbekistan. (2300)

28 March

Moisture retention is starting earlier than usual in Omsk Oblast. (0100)

New orchards and berry gardens are being made in mountainous regions of North Ossetia, where several years of experiment have shown that the sunny slopes are promising for fruit. The area is to become an important industrial fruit farming base. (0130)

Azerbaijan has begun sowing corn. Corn is an important part of the republic's grain crops and the area sown to corn amounts to more than 130,000 hectares excluding post-harvest crops. Corn for grain is to be cultivated by industrial techniques. (0204)

29 March

Cotton sowing has begun in the south of Uzbekistan. Acreage this year will be 70,000 hectares less than last year, but state orders remain the same. It is hoped to increase the yield through new, fertile strains. In Tajikistan cotton will occupy 310,000 hectares, a bit less than in the past years, to make land available for vegetables and feed.

30 March

Corn sowing has begun in Kirghizia. It will be sown on more than 150,000 hectares. (0800)

31 March

Mass sowing of grain crops has started in the Alma-Ata Oblast. Almost 50,000 hectares are sown with grain here. (1100)

1-2 April

No fileworthy items monitored.

Scientific

Cosmonauts on 'Mir' Complex Continue Work

LD3103211689 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1540 GMT 31 Mar 89

[Text] Moscow, 31 Mar (TASS)—The TASS correspondent reports from the Flight Control Center:

During the past 2 days the flight program for cosmonauts Aleksandr Volkov, Sergey Krikalev, and Valeriy Polyakov included geophysical and astrophysical experiments and medical research.

The blood of the cosmonauts has been actually analyzed on board the "Mir" manned complex itself in order to obtain additional information on the functional state of the human organism in conditions of space flight. This work was carried out by doctor and researcher Valeriy Polyakov with the aid of the "Mikrovzor" instrument which was brought into orbit by a transport craft.

Experiments into nonatmospheric astronomy are continuing using the X-ray telescopes of the "Kvant" module. The aim of the research which has been conducted recently is to construct an image of the central part of our galaxy in the X-ray range.

The crew's plan of work for today covers photographing specific parts of the earth's surface, the next series of "Mariya" experiments, and regulation preventive servicing of the complex's onboard systems.

According to reports from orbit and telemetric data, the flight is proceeding normally. The cosmonauts are feeling well.

'Storm of Protest' Over Japanese Space Flight

LD3103124189 Moscow TASS in English 1054 GMT 31 MAR 89

[Text] Moscow March 31 TASS—By TASS correspondent Ivan Ivanov:

The announcement that the first journalist in space will be Japanese has provoked a storm of protest from interested Soviet pressmen.

The decision to send the journalist on an eight-day flight in a Soviet spaceship in 1991 came years and years after the late Soviet rocketry designer Sergey Korolev agreed that allowing a correspondent to join professional cosmonauts in space would be a good idea.

The plan was, however, shelved after he died in 1966.

"The journalistic profession by itself involves competition," commented KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA columnist Yaroslav Golovanov. "I would welcome a Japanese colleague to become the first journalist in space—but in a Japanese spaceship. I would welcome an American on board a U.S. space shuttle.

"But why should the first reporter in space be a Japanese on board a Soviet spaceship and the Soviet orbiting station? There isn't even a grain of logic about this."

A PRAVDA correspondent, attempting to answer the question, had this explanation: "We draw our salaries in ordinary Soviet roubles and cannot pay for the flight in the convertible currency that Glavkosmos (the Soviet space agency) needs so badly".

Many journalists, however, agreed that "it is inadmissible to trade in the nation's prestige" and that it is a matter of pride for the country to be the first to have a journalist in space, and one riding a Soviet craft.

From television screens and newspaper pages, Soviet reporters have been appealing to the cosmonaut training centre and Glavkosmos these days to give a possibility to a Soviet journalist to fly to space first.

The world's first man, woman, doctor and engineer in space have all come from the Soviet Union. Why shouldn't the first journalist in orbit also be a Soviet national?

But perhaps there is a way out.

The agreement signed with Japanese TBS [Tokyo Broadcasting Service] television for its reporter to become a paying passenger on a Soviet space station does not, as far as is known, include a provision for the Japanese to become the world's first journalist in space. Whatever the outcome of the whole story, however, the cosmic barrier to correspondents is being lifted and this is another landmark event in the history of cosmonautics.

This is a U.S. Government publication. Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government. Users of this publication may cite FBIS or JPRS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying them as the secondary source.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, economic, military, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports. All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals. Items generally are processed from the first or best available source; it should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed, with personal and place names rendered in accordance with FBIS transliteration style.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by FBIS/JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how the information was processed from the original. Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear from the original source but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source. Passages in boldface or italics are as published.

SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in eight volumes China, East Europe, Soviet Un[illegible] Near East & South Asia, Sub-Sa[illegible] America, and West Europe Su[illegible] DAILY REPORTs may also be av[illegible] and will be distributed to regular DAILY REPORT subscribers JPRS publications, which include approximately 50 regional, worldwide, and topi[illegible] generally contain less time-sensitive info[illegible] are published periodically

[illegible] REPORTs and JPRS publications are [illegible] *Reports Announcements* issued [illegible] the National Technical Information Se[illegible] 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, V[illegible] and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402

The public may subscribe to either hardcover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630 Subscription rates will be provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTs or JPRS publications (hardcover or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (202) 338-6735,or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013. Department of Defense consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301. (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771.)

Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are not available. Both the DAILY REPORTs and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at many Federal Depository Libraries. Reference copies may also be seen at many public and university libraries throughout the United States.